Инновации. Технологии

Zoltán Németh

A FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE ANALYTIC PAST TENSES
OF THE UDMURT LANGUAGE

This pilot research examines the analytic past forms of the Udmurt language from a new point of view. The grammars and language textbooks do not give enough information about these forms. Because of this I chose a sentence from the Udmurt language corpus, and I created all the forms discussed in this study and asked the native speakers about the differences they can feel among these forms. Based on the results there are two important phenomena in the use of these forms. On the one hand, how many times the action has taken place (once, twice, not important) and on the other hand, if the speaker has a first-hand or a second-hand information about the action that took place.

Keywords: analytic past tenses, Udmurt language, evidentiality.

1. Introduction

The aim of this study is to show a function of Udmurt analytic past tenses, that has never been researched before. The descriptive Udmurt grammars and language textbooks put an emphasis on formal, and morphological descriptions, and pay less attention to the functions they can be used for (more about that later). The description of the analytic past tense forms are often opaque, their functional descriptions are incomplete, for example they do not discuss, whether these forms really express evidential meaning (although it would be possible, as among the analytic past forms there are more than one of those, in which the auxiliary verb is in the second past form, and in one case the main verb has the same characteristics), or they have any other meaning. For this we have to do research with native speaker informants. So, the aim of this paper is to clarify the use of the problematic analytic past forms, and to examine the role of the evidential in these forms. I want to state that my research was carried out in a pilot-research manner.

2. Evidentiality in Udmurt

The role of evidentiality is to discuss the source or type of the information from the point of view of the speaker (Aikhenvald 2004, 3), traditionally separating the direct source from the indirect one. This can be marked in a grammatical way (such as the Estonian quotative, or the Udmurt second past), and in this case marking is usually obligatory [Aikhenvald 2004, 6], or it can be marked with the help of an evidential strategy (like in Hungarian), but in this case marking is optional. If a language marks evidentiality in a grammatical form, then in most cases marking is part of the verbal paradigm. A language can mark more indirect sources at the same time [Aikhenvald 2004, 65], their number can reach up to five, or even more. In these cases, the semantic parameters are usually marked in different ways. In case of a smaller evidential system more semantical meanings can be coded in one grammatical element. [Aikhenvald 2004, 241–242) claims that politeness can also be expressed by means of evidentiality if it is used with the imperative, or it is used in a question, but based on my experiences, in Udmurt it can express evidentiality in declarative sentences as well.

2.1. Second past forms in Udmurt

In the case of the Udmurt language it is commonly accepted that evidential is part of the tense system of the language, to be more precise, part of the past tense. [Winkler's 2001, 49–51] states that evidentiality is a feature of the verbal mood system, but his opinion has been contested by other linguists, like [Kozmács 2008, 168–170] discussed why it cannot be the part of the mood system. This tense is called *тодмотэм ортчем дыр* in Udmurt 'unknown past tense', in Hungarian it is often referred to as *második múlt idő* 'second past tense'.

As Kozmács [2002, 48] also mentions, the Udmurt second past contains many morphological items. To generate these forms the base form is the infinitive form. In Udmurt infinitive forms end in *-ыны* or *-аны*. The endings of the paradigm can be grouped into pairs based on the suffixes they get: the first group contains the 2SG and 3SG forms, the second contains the 2PL and 3PL forms, and the third contains the 1SG and 1PL forms. As it is also noted by [Kozmács 2008, 170–171] the closest language to Udmurt (Komi) the second past form only appears in second and third person. Maybe this could be connected to the fact that the first-person forms are formed in a different way than the others. However, there is a suffix that can be found in all forms, the *-м* suffix, which can also appear in the form of *-ем* or *-эм* (the difference between them is only orthographical, depending on whether the stem is palatalized or not), and in the case of the 3rd group it is always in the form *-ем*. The past participle marker has developed into the second past ending [Kozmács 2008, 101]. This suffix is optionally followed by the possessive suffix[1], except for the 1Sg and 1Pl forms, where it is obligatory to mark the person and the number [Timerhanova 2011, 182–183].

The verbs from the second group ending in *-ыны*, and all the forms ending in *-аны* the whole infitive ending is dropped, but in the 1st and 3rd group, if the verb ends in *-ыны* the *ы* sound stays at the end of the verb, and turns into an *-и* or *-й*[2]. To the stem, the following suffixes are added (respectively to their order): *-ськем(е), -ем(ед)/-эм(ед), -ем(ез)/-эм(ез), ськеммы,-лlям(ды)*[3], *-лlям(зы)* [Timerhanova 2011, 182–183].

In this list it is visible, that there is another suffix that appears in front of the *-м* suffix. In the case of the second group it is *-лlя-* which is the marker of the plural, and in the case of the 3rd group it is *-ськ-*. The *-ськ-* ending has many known functions [Kozmács 2008], but in this case it refers to the lack of control of the speaker over the event.

The negation of the Udmurt second past can be carried out in an analytic and a synthetic way as well. The use of either one has no effect on the meaning, they are in free variation, both being the part of the standard Udmurt. The only difference may be that the analytic form is much more frequent in the northern dialects, and the synthetic is more frequent in the southern dialects [Kel'makov-Hännikeinen 1999, 181]. The analytic form is formed by combining the second past form of the verb and the negation of the verb *to be* (*öвöл*), and the synthetic form is made by changing the *-м-* suffix to *-мте* [Kubitsch 2017, 12–13]. In the 3rd group the *-ськмт-* consonant cluster is solved by adding an *-ы-* sound. In case of negation the marking of person or number becomes fully optional. The synthetic negational forms are the following in respect of the order: *-ськымтэ(е), -мтэ(ед), -мтэ(ез), -ськемтэмы, -лlямтэ(ды), -лlямтэ(зы)* [Timerhanova 2011, 182–183].

2.2. The meanings of the Udmurt second past forms

I will discuss the possible meaning of the Udmurt evidential based on [Kubitsch's 2017] work. Although this is an MA thesis this is the most up-to-date and most in-depth summary of the topic. Kubitsch's aim is to find out the possible meanings related to evidentiality expressed by the Udmurt second past tense forms with the help of a questionnaire, and research carried out on blog texts. [Although Siegl's 2004] diploma work is a much more well-known summary of this topic, I consider Kubitsch's work more relevant in my case, because she examined blog-texts, which are much closer to the spoken language, than Siegl's research on the Pavlik Morozov corpus, which is a shorter Udmurt translation of a Soviet propaganda story.

In the Udmurt evidential system two types of information sources are distinguished by grammatical means: firsthand information and non-firsthand information [Kubitsch 2017, 11]. Based on the section discussing the use of the second past [Kubitsch 2017, 19–35], it covers several semantic parameters related to expressing the source of information and it also bears such functions that are primarily not related to the information source. [Kubitsch 2017, 19–35]. The different functions can be summarized in the following table (table 1).

---

[1] Possessive suffixes are the ones appearing between brackets after the *-м* suffix where the evidential forms are discussed.

[2] Although there are different opinions on whether the *-и/й* is the part of the stem, or it belongs to the suffixes, the aim of this study is to show, which forms appear, so I consider it as the part of the stem for a practical reason: this way the number of the possible endings is smaller, and this way the system is less vague.

[3] In Timerhanova's tables [2011, 182–183] we can find the *-эмды and -емды* forms as well, but these ones are starting to fade away, which is shown by that fact as well, that in these tables they are at a secondary position, and in other books, they are not even mentioned, like in Ganejev and Perevozchikov [2005], and my own experiences during my fieldworks also show that in the 2Pl forms the *-лlя-* suffixes is used, so I will use this form as well.

Table 1

The possible meanings expressed by evidentiality [based on Kubitsch 2017, 19–35]

Functions connected to the source of information	Functions that cannot be connected to the source of information
1. Reportative	1. Characteristics of a genre

2. Inferential
    a) Based on visible result
    b) Based on mental construction
    c) Based on general knowledge about the world
	2. Mirativity
	a) Deferred realization
	b) New, unexpected information

	3. Lack of control over the event

3. Udmurt analytic past forms and evidentiality

Among the analytic past forms in most cases the auxiliary verb is in second past form, and in one case the main verb has this form. So, the question rises, whether these second past forms also express any kind of evidential meaning, and if there is any difference between them in function.

In the Udmurt language there are 4 synthetic tenses (present, first past, second past, future), and there are 4 analytic ones as well. These latter ones are often barely discussed by textbooks and studies focusing on Udmurt tenses, even the latest work on morphology, written by native speakers of the Udmurt language, discusses all these four tenses on only five and a half pages [Timerhanova 2011, 184–189]. It also does not really help the situation of the reader of this study that these barely half page long sections about the different second past forms are mainly morphological descriptions and examples, whereas a functional description is almost completely missing. During my research, except for one informant, all of them could identify these forms, but not all these forms are used these days.

Furthermore, the functional differences are not discussed even in descriptive sections [Timerhanova 2011, 184]: „Тодмо но тодмотэм ортчем дырын каронкылъёсын но вал, вылэм юрттӥсь кылъёсын ҹош верам каронкылъёс кылкабтодос пуштроссыя синонимъёс луо (пуштроссыя кӧня ке пӧртэмгес ке но)." (Translation: The ones formed by the first and second past forms of the verb and the *вал, вылэм* auxiliary verbs, in their meanings are synonymous to each other (although there is a small difference in their meaning).").

If they are really synonyms, then the following question rises: Why does Udmurt have three (four?)[4] different forms (first past + *вал,* first past + *вылэм (?),* second past + *вал,* second past + *вылэм*), if they are interchangeable, and there is no difference in meaning? Although there are redundant phenomena in the languages, but it seems too much for a language to have three (or four?) forms to express the very same meaning/phenomenon/function. Furthermore, even though the author mentions, that there is a small difference between the meanings, she does not discuss what exactly this difference is, although it would be really helpful for the reader to differentiate these two tenses.

In the followings I will describe these analytical past forms based on the morphological work edited by [Timerhanova 2011, 184–189], because this is the most up-to-date, and one of the longest summaries of these past tense forms, which was written by a native speaker of the Udmurt language.

3.1. The formation of the analytic past tense forms

The analytic past forms can be formed by the four synthetic verb forms, and the *вал* (first past) and/or *вылэм* (second past) forms of the verb ('to be'). The morphology edited by [Timerhanova 2011, 184–187] starts the presentation of these four forms with the ones called *нырысетӥ кемалась ортчем дыр* and *кыкетӥ кемалась ортчем дыр* (in English 'first bygone past tense' and 'second bygone past tense'). The first is formed with the first past form of the verb and the *вал* auxiliary verb, and the later with the second past form of the verb and the *вал/вылэм* auxiliary verbs.

Their negating forms are formed with the negative form of the main verb plus the unchanged version of the auxiliary verb. Although in the case of the second past form the negation can be carried out in a synthetic and an analytic way as well, in the case of the *кыкетӥ кемалась ортчем дыр* only the synthetic form is mentioned.

---

[4] Although Timerhanova [2011] differentiates 3 different forms, as I will show, it is possible, that maybe there is a fourth form as well

The next one discussed [Timerhanova 2011, 187–188] is the *кема ортчем дыр* (in English 'bygone past tense'), which is formed by the present tense form of the main verb and the *вал/вылэм* auxiliary verb. The negation is formed the same way as in the case of the previous two forms, the negated present tense form of the main verb and the unchanged form of the *вал/вылэм* auxiliary verbs.

The fourth analytic past form is the *трос пол ортчем дыр* (in English lit. 'many times [happened] past tense') [Timerhanova 2011, 188–189], that is formed by the use of the future tense form of the verb and the *вал/вылэм* auxiliary verbs. The negation follows the analogy mentioned earlier: the negation of the future tense form of the main verb used together with the *вал/вылэм* auxiliary verbs. The exact meaning expressed by this form does not mean any challenges in the case of this tense: it is used to express actions/events that happened regularly in the past, therefore the name (*трос пол* 'many times'). The analytic tenses will be shown by examples a bit later (table 2).

Table 2

The analytic past forms of the verbs *мыныны* and *буяны*

	мыныны 'to go'		*буяны* 'to paint'	
simple plusquamperfect (*кема ортчем дыр*)				
1Sg	мынйсько		буясько	
2Sg	мынйськод		буяськод	
3Sg	мынэ	вал/вылэм	буя	вал/вылэм
1Pl	мынйськом(ы)		буяськом(ы)	
2Pl	мынйськоды		буяськоды	
3Pl	мынйськозы		буяськозы	
first plusquamperfect (*нырысетй кемалась ортчем дыр*)				
1Sg	мынй		буяй	
2Sg	мынйд		буяд	
3Sg	мынйз	вал(/вылэм)	буяз	вал(/вылэм)
1Pl	мынйм(ы)		буям(ы)	
2Pl	мынйды		буяды	
3Pl	мынйзы		буязы	
second plusquamperfect (*кыкетй кемалась ортчем дыр*)				
1Sg	мынйськем(е)		буяськем(е)	
2Sg	мынэмед		буямед	
3Sg	мынэм(ез)	вал/вылэм	буям(ез)	вал/вылэм
1Pl	мынйськемды		буяськеммы	
2Pl	мынйллям(ды)		буяллям(ды)	
3Pl	мынйллям(зы)		буяллям(зы)	
frequentative past (*трос пол ортчем дыр*)				
1Sg	мыно		буяло	
2Sg	мынод		буялод	
3Sg	мыноз	вал/вылэм	буялоз	вал/вылэм
1Pl	мыном(ы)		буялом(ы)	
2Pl	мыноды		буялоды	
3Pl	мынозы		буялозы	

3.2. Problems with the naming and the use of the analytic past tense forms

Translating the names of these tenses can cause problems, not only in the case of English, for example there are Hungarian sources that mention these forms [Csúcs 1990; Kozmács 2002], but they do not give a name for them, so there is no terminology even in the most widely spoken Finno-Ugric language. If we observe the Udmurt names, then we can find, that both *кема ортчем дыр* and *кемалась ортчем дыр* means something that happened in the bygone past, with the only difference, that *кемалась* goes back into the past even farther, but it is not discussed anywhere exactly how much further it goes. It does not only make the formation of the terminology harder, but also does not really help in the choice of the correct past tense form. In the translation of the terminology we can take advantage of the fact that the *нырысетй* and the *кыкетй кемлась ортчем дыр* are being refered to as *first* and *second plusquamperfect* as well [Timerhanova 2011,

184], so for those we can use this terminology in English as well (for Hungarian it can be *első plusquamperfect* and *második plusquamperfect*), and as the *кема ортчем дыр* is the most commonly used version of the analytic past tenses, it can be referred as *simple plusquamperfect* (in Hungarian it can be *egyszerű régmúlt*). As we can see the least problematic one is the *трос пол ортчем дыр* but giving a name for this past tense can be also challenging. Based on the original Udmurt name of this tense, the *frequentative past* could be used for it (in Hungarian the *frekventatív múlt* can be used).

4. The research

As I have already mentioned, the use of the frequentative past form is unambiguous, so this is the one, that cannot really cause any problems in understanding for a person studying Udmurt, as its meaning can be clearly differentiated from the meaning of the other forms, so this form is not included in my research.
My research was carried out in the following way: from the Udmurt corpus[5] I chose a random sentence in which the verb was in simple plusquamperfect form:

Удмурти-е	куриськ-е	вал	öз
Udmurtia-ILL	ask-PRES.3SG	to.be.PST	NEG.PST

лэз-е	Хабаровск-е	улыны	интыя-зы
allow-NEG.PST.3PL	Habarovsk-ILL	to.live	place-PST.3PL

'He asked for permission to go to Udmurtia, but he wasn't allowed to do so, he was sent to Habarovsk to live there'

Altogether six sentences were created by changing only the berb to all possible analytic past tense forms, including the one considered non-existent, the present tense form of the main verb and the *вылэм* auxiliary verb. Then I asked native speakers to describe the differences in the meaning of these 6 sentences. I asked 6 native speakers to answer my question (one of them got the sentences in a printed form, the other five were contacted via internet). My informants were all females. I chose to ask only female native speakers as the language use of women tends to be more conservative than the language use of the men [Labov 1991, 206], so this way there is a much higher chance that they will be able to differentiate these forms from one another. These six informants were chosen in a way that the different Udmurt dialects should have been represented. Moreover not only their sex was the same, but they were all fluent speakers of the Udmurt language, and they were all university students, or young Udmurts, who had finished their studies at university not so long ago. Although all 6 people assured me to send an answer, in the end only 4 of them answered my question. The lack of answers from that two people could occur, because they could not differentiate the meaning of the sentences, but they did not want to admit it. This assumption, and the fact that one of them admitted that she could not differentiate them supports the hypothesis that these analytic past forms (at least a part of them) are not part of the active language use anymore. Although the number of answers is quite small, we still have answers from the speakers of the northern and southern dialect of the Udmurt language, and one of the informants is from Izhevsk, the capital city of Udmurtia, which is linguistically a Russian dominant city. The answers were congruent, but before I expose the results, I would like to mention three important comments. First, there was only one person who could not fit the first plusquamperfect + *вылэм* auxiliary verb form (the form that according to the grammar is non-existent) into the system, but not even this person said that it would be an incorrect form, she just said that this form is not used in her dialect. The second thing to mention is that, as I mentioned above, there was one person to whom there was no difference in meaning between these sentences (*„мон понна соос вообще ваньмыз огкадесь"* 'As for me they are all the same'). She only found some difference between the two different forms of the simple plusquamperfect, but even the difference between them is neglectable. The third interesting thing is that according to the answers of the these native speakers the second plusquamperfect + *вал* auxiliary verb, and the simple plusquamperfect + вылэм have the same meaning, although according to Timerhanova's morphology [2011, 184] the interchangeable forms are the first and second plusquamperfect forms.

---

[5] http://web-corpora.net/UdmurtCorpus.

The answers were summarized in a table based on whether the event happened once, multiple times, or it is irrelevant how many times it happened, and based on whether the speaker knows how the event passed, or she has only non-firsthand information about it, so the evidentiality has a role in the differentiation of the meaning.

The results

The congruent answers of my informants can be summarized in the following table (table 3).

Table 3

The results

	Irrelevant	Once	Multiple times	Firsthand	Non-firsthand (reported)
simple plusquamperfect with вал	■	■			■
simple plusquamperfect with вылэм	■		■	■	
1ˢᵗ plusquamperfect with вал	■		■		■
1ˢᵗ plusquamperfect with вылэм		■	■		
2ⁿᵈ plusquamperfect with вал	■		■	■	
2ⁿᵈ plusquamperfect with вылэм		■	■	■	

As it is visible the *вылэм* and *вал* variants of the simple plusquamperfect are in a complementary relationship. The variant with the *вал* auxiliary verb expresses an event that happened multiple times, while the variant with the *вылэм* auxiliary verb expresses an event that happened only once, and the information is considered non-firsthand from an evidential point of view. The following question rises: Is it possible to express somehow that an event happened multiple times, while the information is considered non-firsthand? The multiple time meaning appears in simple plusquamperfect with the *вал* auxiliary verb, and the first plusquamperfect with the *вал* auxiliary verb expresses that it only happened once and the speaker has first-hand experience about it. The frequentative past with the *вал* auxiliary would be a good guess, but it carries a habitual meaning as well, which is not necessarily the case in this situation.

It is also visible, that both in first and second plusquamperfect if the *вылэм* auxiliary verb is used, it becomes irrelevant how many times the event happened. We can also conclude that in these tenses the form of the main verb shows if the speaker has first- or non-firsthand information about how the event happened. The only exception is the first plusquamperfect with the *вылэм* auxiliary verb, because in that case both first-hand and non-firsthand experience is marked. How can it happen? It can be explained the following way: the speaker has firsthand knowledge about the fact that this event happened, but she is not familiar with the exact details about the way it happened. To put it in another way: in all the other cases the fact that the person went for the committee to ask for permission is handled as one single event, no matter if the speaker is familiar with the circumstances or not, but in this case the asking for permission, and the way it is asked is separated from each other. So, this form (which according to the grammar does not exist) fits into the system, as the speaker is aware of the fact that the event happened, just has no knowledge about how it happened.

There are more results that can be found if we put those forms next to each other, where the auxiliary verbs are the same, but the main verbs stand in different forms. In this case it becomes visible that the simple plusquamperfect with the *вал* auxiliary is in a complementary relationship with the second plusquamperfect formed with the same auxiliary. As the auxiliary verbs are in the same form, it should be the main verb that carries the difference in meaning. So the one in which the main verb is in present tense form, the main verb expresses that it happened multiple times and the speaker has firsthand experience about the event, and the one in which the main verb is in second past form expresses that the event happened only once, and the speaker has only non-firsthand experience about the event. But if the form of the main verbs remains the same and we change the auxiliary to its second past, then the auxiliary verb will be the one showing that it is non-firsthand knowledge of the speaker and the form of the main verb will express whether the event happened only once, or it is irrelevant how many times it happened.

In the case of putting the forms with the same forms of the main verbs next to each other with the different auxiliaries, then we can see that compared to the previous complementary situation, here the auxiliary verbs will be the ones carrying all the meanings, as the forms of the main verbs are the same, so it cannot be the result of the differences. In this case in the second plusquamperfect the main verbs second past form expresses that the speaker has non-firsthand information, and the auxiliary verb expresses that the event hap-

pened only once, or it is irrelevant how many times it happened. In the case of the first plusquamperfect the situation is a bit more complicated. The first past form of the verb expresses that the speaker has a first hand experience about the action, and the *вал* auxiliary expresses that it happened only once, but the *вылэм* has a dual meaning, as it expresses that it is irrelevant, how many times it happened, and also that, that the speaker does not have any firsthand information about how the event happened.

5. Summary

Based on the results we can state the following. Although in the morphology edited by [Timerhanova 2011, 184–187] there is only one form of the plusquamperfect, based on the results, the speakers could easily fit the one considered non existent in the system, and it was fitted in the same way. What is even more interesting about fitting it in in the same way is that this form has a much more complicated meaning than the others (as it separates the event from the way the event happened), so it is interesting, why it is not included in the descriptions. We can also state that according to the results the simple plusquamperfect with the *вылэм* auxiliary and the second plusquamperfect with the *вал* auxiliary express the same thing, namely, that the event happened only once, and the speaker has non-firsthand knowledge about it. So, based on this, and the fact that in Timerhanova's work on morphology [Timerhanova 2011, 184] the meanings of the first and second plusquamperfect forms are interchangeable, we could assume that in this case, except for the simple plusquamperfect with the *вылэм* auxiliary, all the other examined forms are interchangeable. But this would mean, that this is a heavily redundant system in the Udmurt language. We can stick to this statement, and then we can assume that these analytic past forms start to lose their original meanings, because the speakers do not really feel the urge to use these forms anymore, or it can occur because of the constant contact with the Russian language which does not have these kind of analytic past forms. Maybe this decline of the system is really happening in the present-day Udmurt language, but based on the results we got, we can still find the possible core meaning of these forms:

• simple plusquamperfect with the *вал* auxiliary: expresses an event in the past that happened multiple times, and the speaker has first-hand experience about it;

• simple plusquamperfect with the *вылэм* auxiliary: expresses an event in the past that happened once, and the speaker has non-firsthand experience about it;

• first plusquamperfect with the *вал* auxiliary: expresses an event in the past that happened once, and the speaker has first-hand experience about it;

• first plusquamperfect with the *вылэм* auxiliary: expresses an event in the past for which it is irrelevant, how many times did it happen, and the speaker has first-hand experience about the event taking place, but does not have any information about how it happened;

• second plusquamperfect with the *вал* auxiliary: expresses an event in the past that happened once, and the speaker has non-firsthand experience about it;

• second plusquamperfect with the *вылэм* auxiliary: expresses an event in the past for which it is irrelevant, how many times did it happen, and the speaker has non-firsthand experience about it;

Also, it is fair to state that for someone who studies Udmurt it can cause a lot of problems to differentiate these forms, because it is not regular, whether the main verb causes the differences or the auxiliary verbs.

My aim for the future is to investigate this topic further, to support the theory I presented above, and also to make further investigations in the Udmurt corpus to find out, whether the forms having the evidential meaning in them have the potential to express politeness [Aikhenvald 2004, 241–242]. However, based on the system I presented above, only the non-firsthand meaning appeared in those cases where the second past form was used. which strongly limits the possibility to express politeness, because for that, the lack of control over the event is much more suitable.

REFERENCES

Aikhenvald A. Y. *Evidentiality*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2004. 452 p. In English.

Csúcs S. *Chrestomatia Votiacica*, Budapest, Tankönyvkiadó, 1990. 223 p. In Hungarian.

Ganeev I., Perevozčikov J. *Marym les'a*. Izhevsk, Udmurtia, 2005. 203 p. In Udmurt.

Kel'makov V., Hännikäinen S. *Udmurtin kielioppia ja harjotuksia,* Helsinki, Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 1999. 335 p. In Finnish.

Kozmács I. *Udmurt nyelvkönyv*, Szeged, JATE Press, 2002. 104 p. In Hungarian.

Kozmács I. *Az -śk- képző az udmurt (votják) igeképzés rendszerében*, Nyitra, 2008. 196 p. In Hungarian.

Kubitsch R. *Evidencialitás a mai udmurt nyelvben*, Szegedi Tudományegyetem: MA thesis, 2017. 47 p. In Hungarian.

Labov W. *The intersection of sex and social class in the course of linguistic change,* Vol. 2. Issue 2., USA, Cambridge University Press. 1990. 205–54 pp. In English.

Siegl F. *The 2nd past in the permic languages*, Tartu Ülikool: MA thesis. 2004. 189 p. In English.

Timerhanova N N. (ed.), *Udmurt kyllen kylkabtodosez*, Izhevsk, Izdatel'stvo „Udmurtskii Universitet", 2011. 408 p. In Udmurt.

Winkler E. Udmurt. In: *Languages of the World: Materials 212*. München, Lincom Europa, 2001. 85 p. In English.

Németh Zoltán,
PhD student
University of Szeged
Hungary, 6722, Szeged, Egyetem str. 2.
E-mail: nemethzoltan991@gmail.com

Немет Золтан
ФУНКЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ АНАЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ПРОШЕДШИХ ВРЕМЕН УДМУРТСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

В данном пилотном исследовании сложные формы прошедшего времени удмуртского языка рассматриваются с новой точки зрения. В имеющихся пособиях по грамматике и языку информация об этих формах представлена недостаточно. Поэтому, выбрав одно предложение из корпуса удмуртского языка, автор создал все возможные формы, представленные в данном исследовании, после чего опросил носителей языка о различиях между формами. На основе полученных результатов выявлены два важных аспекта, связанные с использованием указанных форм. Во-первых, имеет значение, сколько раз было совершено определенное действие (один раз, многократно, либо неважно). Во-вторых, существенно получена ли говорящим информация о ситуации напрямую или косвенным образом.

Ключевые слова: аналитическое прошедшее время, удмуртский язык, эвиденциальность.

Поступила в редакцию 21.06.2019

Немет Золтан,
докторант
Университет г. Сегед
Венгрия, 6722, г. Сегед, ул. Эдетэм, 2
E-mail: nemethzoltan991@gmail.com