

Petar KEHAYOV
Florian SIEGL

THE EVIDENTIAL PAST PARTICIPLE IN ESTONIAN RECONSIDERED¹

The paper deals with the development of the past participle in Estonian into an evidential predicate. It is a reply to a recent reconstruction attempt (Metslang, Muižniece & Pajusalu 1999) which advocated a linear development from the ancient use of participles as predicates into their evidential and other finite uses. We argue that this reconstruction suffers both methodologically and from incorrect interpretation of the cross-linguistic evidence. Our conclusion is that the evidential use of the past participle in Estonian is by no means derived from the functions of its proto-language ascendant as implied by Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu, but rather is due to reanalysis of a grammatical construction containing the past participle. In other words it is the meaning of the construction itself and not the ancient function of the participle which is projected onto the modern evidential usage. This conclusion is reached after a thorough examination of the corresponding grammatical phenomena in Eastern Finno-Ugric and Baltic.

INTRODUCTION

The Estonian *modus obliquus* is a central morphosyntactic feature which distinguishes this language from all other Finnic idioms besides Livonian. At least since Wiedemann's "Grammatik der ehstnischen Sprache" this phenomenon (then *Relativ*) has been known in more detail (Wiedemann 1875: 460-461; 473-474). In the first half of the

¹ This study was supported by grants no. 5202 (Estonian typological grammar: syntax) and partly by no. 4643 (History and typology of the Finnic languages) of the Estonian Science Foundation.

20th century Finnic linguistics dealt abundantly with this phenomenon before the interest faded for several decades. In a paper from 1999 Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu challenged the traditional view concerning the development of evidentiality in Estonian. They tentatively suggested that the evidential use of the bare past participle in Estonian is neither the result of the reanalysis of an earlier participial subordinating construction nor the result of the ellipse of the copula in periphrastic past tense, but rather reflects the preservation of the ancient uses of participles as predicates. In this contribution we reopen the debate by showing that the evidence from Mari and Baltic used in support of this new hypothesis has been misinterpreted. We also show that other relevant languages (Komi, Udmurt and Saami) cannot be put in service for such reconstruction either and that even Estonian itself provides some evidence against it.

1. THE ESTONIAN EVIDENTIAL FROM A TYPOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

In her universal classification of evidentiality systems Aleksandra Aikhenvald divides them according to the number of information sources encoded. She distinguishes between two-term (A), three-term (B), four-term (C), and five-(or-more)-term systems (D). Each of the types is further divided into subtypes according to the semantics of the 'terms' (Aikhenvald 2004: 23-25).

The Estonian system is subsumed under type A3, where reported evidentiality is the marked term of the system and the non-reported is the unmarked (Aikhenvald 2004: 33). The reported term is most commonly labeled in Estonian linguistics *quotative* or *modus obliquus* (MO). Although MO displays uniform semantics throughout the language area, there is an astounding variety of formatives used to mark it, most of them being in complementary dialectal distribution (see Erelt ed., 2003: 202 for a short overview). The only formative, which is spread throughout the whole language area, is the past participle, which occurs as a finite predicate and is used to mark MO in past tense. At the same time, since 1920s the prevailing formative of MO in Standard Written Estonian has been the partitive form of the present participle (so called *vat*-form). This form is combined with the past

participle to produce compound forms of MO. The use of the bare past participle is frequently encountered in traditional narratives (fairy-tales etc.), but otherwise is quite limited in modern written Estonian. Consider, however, the following passage from contemporary fiction, where both forms occur:

- (1) *Ta jutustas Lavranile oma isast, kes olevat tüüpiline New Yorki juut. Kord oli üks naine, kelle pool ta Tartus oli elanud, hakanud temaga rääkima marurikastest Ameerika juutidest. Naine teinud seda mõnevõrra halvustavalt, ning Carol polnud öelnud oma võõrustajale, et temagi on juut, kelle isa on ajaloolane ja on New Yorgi Ülikoolis ajalugu õpetanud.*
 She tell-IMP.F.3SG Lavran-ALL own father-ELA who **be-PRS.PTCP-PART(=MO)**
 typical New York-GEN Jew Once be-IMP.F.3SG one woman who-GEN
 side she Tartu-INE be-IMP.F.3SG live-PST.PTCP start-PST.PTCP she-COM
 talk-INF madly_rich-PL-ELA America-GEN Jew-PL-ELA woman
do-PST.PTCP(=MO) it to_some_degree contemptuously and Carol
 NEG.be-PST.PTCP say-PST.PTCP her host-ALL that she-ENCL is Jew
 who-GEN father is historian and is New York-GEN University-INE
 history-PART teach-PST.PTCP

‘She told Lavran about her father who **is** (= **is said to be**) a typical New York Jew. There was a woman once, at whose place she was living in Tartu, who had started to tell her about all those madly rich American Jews. The woman **had done** (= **was said to have done**) this with some contempt in her voice, so Carol had not told her that she is Jew herself and that her farther is a historian who has been teaching history at the University of New York.’ (Pilter: 28)

Occurrences of the past participle as *teinud* in (1) will be further called either ‘evidential past participle’ or ‘bare past participle’ depending on which side of the phenomenon (functional or formal) is referred to.

2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARTICIPLES INTO EVIDENTIAL MARKERS: PREVIOUS ACCOUNTS

There is a remarkable consensus concerning the development of the present participle (*vat*-form) into the quotative marker in Estonian.

According to the widely accepted view, the source domain were participial subordinating constructions, and the genesis of MO is conditioned by the ellipse of the superordinate verb of a speech-act or mental state (further we will call such verbs PCU-verbs = perception-cognition-utterance; see Givón 2001 II: 40-43). This idea reaches back to F. J. Wiedemann (1875: 651-652). Later, the same idea was advocated by L. Kettunen (1924: 20), M. Airila (1935: 48) and V. Grünthal (1941: 259-260). K. Leetberg (1925: 79), followed by A. Saareste (1932: 18) and O. Ikola (1953: 41-43), took into consideration also another possibility, viz. that the present tense forms of MO could have come into existence through the contamination of the *et*-complementation and the participial construction. This idea was favored also by subsequent studies (Hakulinen & Leino 1987; Campbell 1991). Lyle Campbell presents the following grammaticalization cline:

- (2) a) *sai kuulda, et seal üks mees elab*²
 got hear-INF that there one.NOM man.NOM live-3PRES.INDICATIVE
 ‘She came to hear / she heard that a man lives there.’
- b) *sai kuulda seal ühe mehe elavat*
 got hear-INF there one.GEN man.GEN live-PRES.PARTCP
 ‘He came to hear / he heard of a man’s living there.’
- c) *sai kuulda, (et) seal üks mees elavat*
 got hear-INF that there one.NOM man.NOM live-MODUS.OBLIQUUS
 ‘He came to hear / he heard that (they say) a man lives there.’
- d) *ta tegevat tööd*
 he.NOM do-PRES.INDIR work-PARTV
 ‘They say he is working.’

The contamination (c) of complement clause (a) and participial construction (b) resulted in extension of the subordinated verb into main clause (d) (Campbell 1991: 287).

In contrast to the situation with present participles as markers of MO, the question about the origin of the past participles in that function has caused considerable controversy among scholars. One can distinguish between three main hypotheses.

² Campbell’s glossing system is preserved in the cited examples.

According to the first, the source domains were participles used as a complementation strategy (see e.g. Wiedemann 1875: 651-652, Saareste 1932: 18, Campbell 1991, Alvre 1993, Künnap 1994). Ago Künnap applied the model presented by Campbell to explain the development of the past participle as well (Künnap 1994: 24):

- (3) a) *sai kuulda, et seal üks mees elas*
 got hear-INF that there one.NOM man.NOM live-3IMPRF.INDICATIVE
 ‘She came to hear / she heard that a man lived there.’
- b) *sai kuulda seal ühe mehe elanud (olevat)*
 got hear-INF there one.GEN man.GEN live-PST.PARTCP be-PST.PARTCP
 ‘He came to hear / he heard of a man’s who lived there.’
- c) *sai kuulda, (et) seal üks mees elanud*
 got hear-INF that there one.NOM man.NOM live-MODUS.OBLIQUUS
 ‘He came to hear / he heard that (they say) a man lived there.’
- d) *seal elanud üks mees*
 there live-MODUS.OBLIQUUS one.NOM man.NOM
 ‘A man lived there.’

According to the second hypothesis, the source was a periphrastic past tense. Here one can distinguish between two different viewpoints. According to the first one, the omitted element was a participial or infinitive form of the auxiliary used to express MO: *tema olevat/olla tulnud* > *tema Ø tulnud* (Kask 1984: 243). The second viewpoint is that the omission of the auxiliary took place within the indicative paradigm of compound tenses and the omitted element was the finite form of the auxiliary: *on elanud kord / oli elanud kord* > *Ø elanud kord* (see Ikola 1953: 51-58; Künnap 1992, 1994; Metslang 1994). The auxiliary-ellipse hypothesis is based on a certain phenomenon in Finnic languages, namely the absence of the auxiliary in compound tense forms. Besides Estonian, this is characteristic for (at least) the easternmost dialects of Finnish (Ikola 1953: 51-58; Kuiri 1984: 240), Veps (Laanest 1982: 235) and the extinct Krevin dialect of Votic (Winkler 1997: 279, 387).

According to the supporters of the third hypothesis, the evidential use of the past participle derives from its use as a predicate in narrative discourse. The idea was suggested by Villem Grünthal (1941: 261-262), who referred to a similar development in the use of deverbal nouns in Permic and Samoyed. Grünthal himself considered such

reconstruction more than doubtful and subsequent studies (e.g. Ikola 1953: 58) rejected it. Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu (1999), who looked this time for parallels in Mari and in Baltic, brought Grünthal's hypothesis back to life. The hypothesis is based on the presumption that the use of the past participle as a predicate is an ancient feature both in Finno-Ugric and Indo-European languages (Metslang, Muižniece, Pajusalu 1999: 137).

As can be seen, the first two hypotheses state that the evidential use of the participle evolved from a certain type of construction (PCU-complementation or compound tense forms), whereas the third sees the origin in the old predicative function of the participle in monologue discourse. To put it differently, the first two are based on the presumption that the participle was initially bound in a construction, which as a whole expressed quotative meaning, and only after that developed into an independent evidential main predicate. The third hypothesis however states that the participle was the primary main predicate, and that its sphere of use became gradually narrower, until finally, in modern standard Estonian, it became restricted to only quotative and few other (even more peripheral) meaning domains.

In the following chapters, we will discuss the prospects of the third hypothesis. In §3 and §4 we will demonstrate that the evidence from Eastern Finno-Ugric and from Baltic respectively cannot be used in support of this hypothesis. In the first part of §5 we will address some methodological problems within the argumentation presented by Metslang, Muižniece, Pajusalu (1999), while in the second part we will demonstrate that even Estonian provides some evidence against their hypothesis.

3. THE FINNO-PERMIC EVIDENCE

We will now show why neither Mari nor the more distant related languages Komi and Udmurt have any relevance for the interpretation of the Estonian evidential. Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu's "form-centered approach" (1999: 128) has followed a traditional comparative-historical perspective. In our argumentation however, we do not follow this approach. Traditional comparative-historical Uralic linguistics is concerned with the reconstruction of phonology and mor-

phology; these are however the “meaningless” parts of grammar and as such have nothing to say about the syntax of the reconstructed forms. Every reconstructed form had its own syntax, but this syntax cannot be predicted from morphology only.³ A cross-linguistic perspective in historical syntax was introduced by Campbell & Harris (1995) which demonstrated that historical syntax and historical phonology share only the idea of language history but not their methodology. The absence of older written sources for Uralic languages has never been a major obstacle for historical phonology, but this continuously poses problems for historical syntax. Therefore cross-linguistic (typological) syntax and grammaticalization theory must receive more attention in further historical syntactic research otherwise there is little hope for progress. This study is intended to show a possible consensus by introducing these new tools. However, for now we have to limit ourselves to the Finno-Permic branch of the Finno-Ugric family.⁴

3.1. The origin of the Finnic *-nUt* participle

The dichotomy of two structurally opposed possibilities to express past tense reference is spread all over the Finnic area. The following examples come from standard Finnish and Estonian; for a survey on other Finnic languages see Laanest (1982: 233-235; 248-250).

³ Although a similar claim was made by Raun in the late 1980s (Raun 1988: 568-569), the situation has not changed in contemporary comparative historical Finno-Ugric linguistics and the findings of historical syntax have not evolved any further from Paavo Ravila's ideas (see e.g. Bartens 1981). The only major exception is FOKOS-FUCHS, D. R., 1962, “Die Rolle der Syntax in der Frage nach Sprachverwandschaft”, Ural-Altäische Bibliothek XI, Wiesbaden, though this monograph has an entirely different intention.

⁴ We are aware that evidentiality in Ob-Ugric and Samoyedic has been addressed earlier, but for a comparative historical approach it is still too early. Besides, we wish to stress also that our argument is concerned first and foremost with the Finnish branch of Finno-Ugric family!

Imperfect:

fi: *Poika joi maitoa.*
 boy drink-IMPF.3Sg milk-PART
 ‘The boy drank some milk’

ee: *Poiss jõi piima.*
 Boy drink-IMPF.3Sg milk-PART
 ‘The boy drank some milk’

Perfect:

fi: *Poika on juonut maitoa.*
 boy be.PRS.3Sg drink-PST.PTCP milk-PART
 ‘The boy drank (has drunken) some milk’

ee: *Poiss on joonud piima.*
 boy be.PRS.3Sg drink-PST.PTCP milk-PART
 ‘The boy drank (has drunken) some milk’

Historically, the imperfect is formed by the insertion of the past-tense marker *-i*, though during the history of the individual Finnic languages new markers emerged. In Estonian, Votic, Livonian and the Finnish dialects of South-Western Finland, an imperfect marker in *-s* arose as a result of a secondary metaanalysis of verbs with a stem in *-t*, e.g. **makat-in > *makasin > magasin* ‘I slept’ (Finnic *ti- > si-*).⁵

Also the formation of the perfect in Finnic is structurally quite uniform. It is based on the inflected form of the copula ‘to be’ (inflected in present tense) and the active past participle *-nUt*, although it is known, that some Finnic languages or at least their dialects can omit the copula (see e.g. Ikola 1953: 51-58; Kuiri 1984: 240; Kettunen 1943: 70-73; Laanest 1982: 235; Winkler 1997: 279, 387).

The question of the origin of the *-nUt* participle has been connected to the question of the origin of the perfect in Finnic. So far, no etymological cognates in other related languages could be identified (Korhonen 1973: 178; Hakulinen 1979: 215; Laanest 1982: 235) and so its overall age is hard to estimate.

⁵ This development created also other markers which are not of interest here (see Laanest 1982: 254-255).

3.2. The 2nd preterit in Mari

The perfect's evidential usage is a characteristic feature of the Volga-Kama Sprachbund (for a general though slightly outdated overview see Serebrennikov 1960). In Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu (1999), Mari serves as an example for "another" Finno-Ugric language that has developed an evidential marker from an old predicative participle.⁶ There are however many facts which speak against such an interpretation.

The past tense system of Mari⁷ is formally quite similar to the Finnic system; Mari, too, makes a distinction between synthetically and periphrastically formed past tenses. The following paradigms show 1st and 2nd preterit in both conjugations in the Eastern dialects.

| | 1 st preterit | | 2 nd preterit | |
|-----|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|
| | 1 st conj | 2 nd conj | 1 st conj | 2 nd conj |
| | <i>purāš</i> 'to bite' | <i>kolaš</i> 'to die' | <i>purāš</i> 'to bite' | <i>kolaš</i> 'to die' |
| 1Sg | <i>purām</i> | <i>kolāšām</i> | <i>purānam</i> | <i>kolenam</i> |
| 2Sg | <i>purāč</i> | <i>kolāšāč</i> | <i>purānat</i> | <i>kolenat</i> |
| 3Sg | <i>puro</i> | <i>kolāš</i> | <i>purān</i> | <i>kolen</i> |

⁶ It is very interesting that Metslang, Muižniece & Pajusalu 1999 did neither present examples nor a valid bibliographical note for backing up their statement. In their article, one finds "The past participle expressed the completion of an event and thus it's past character. Nowadays, such a use of the participle as a predicate that expresses the past can still be found in many eastern cognate languages (e.g. in Cheremis, which has many nominal sentences) where it is used in storytelling and listing events in narrative texts." (Metslang, Muižniece & Pajusalu 1999: 138). In the course of the paragraph, Metslang, Muižniece & Pajusalu refer to Hakulinen & Leino 1987. Controlling the quotation, one finds a short footnote (Hakulinen & Leino 1987: 40, footnote 6): "In all Uralic languages, the perfect tense form without the copula, i.e. the participle on its own, is particularly frequent in narratives." In both cases it is very strange, that Bartens 1979 and Stipa 1960, whose monographs deal with this topic, were not consulted. En passant, it must be mentioned that already Stipa denied any connections between the Estonian and Livonian MO and the Permic 2nd past (Stipa 1960: 192-200).

⁷ Our discussion is based on Alho Alhoniemi's grammar (Alhoniemi 1985: 110-112, 120-121).

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1Pl | <i>purna</i> | <i>kolašna</i> | <i>puranna</i> | <i>kolenna</i> |
| 2Pl | <i>purđa</i> | <i>kolašta</i> | <i>puranda</i> | <i>kolenda</i> |
| 3Pl | <i>purəč</i> | <i>kolašt</i> | <i>purənət</i> | <i>kolenət</i> |

Historically, the 1st preterit used the same marker *-j* as the Finnic languages. Although this marker is lost today, it has left its traces which can be shown by several palatalization phenomena which are not of any importance here. A closer look at the verbal endings of the 2nd preterit reveals rather different structure. Although the 2nd preterit behaves syntactically like a verb, it is based on a converb construction⁸; the *-n* converb is followed by a reduced form of the present tense form of *ulaš* ‘to be’; 3Sg is formed by the converb alone.⁹ Also the Vx used in the 2nd preterit are actually the same endings as in 1st conjugation’s present tense paradigm (not listed here). Even though the usage of the 2nd preterit has some “evidential scent” (see Alho-niemi’s characterization, 120-121), it should have become clear, that it is based on a completely different construction from that found in Estonian. The Mari 2nd preterit is still a past tense with an additional evidential shading of type A1 (‘Firsthand and Non-firsthand’; Aikhenvald 2004: 26-29).¹⁰

The probably most convincing argument against the linking of the Estonian evidential past participle to the Mari 2nd preterit is the fact that Mari’s 2nd preterit has a parallel in Chuvash.¹¹ The origin of the 2nd preterit in Mari has been subject to several diverging opinions. By

⁸ “Das Gerundium auf *-en, -n* is also ein etwas nominales Verbaladverb; aber doch soweit Verbum, daß es das Objekt im Objektskasus zu sich nimmt.” (Lewy 1922: 144).

⁹ The fact that in 1st and 2nd person the copula is present (although in a phonologically reduced form) makes a comparison between Estonian and Mari impossible, because the participle based form in Estonian is not accompanied by a copula at all. Besides, the Estonian participle is not marked for person either.

¹⁰ Previously labeled ‘Eyewitness and Noneyewitness’ (cf. Aikhenvald 2003: 3-4).

¹¹ The functional equivalent in Chuvash is the “nomen perfect” or past participle in *-nă/-ně* (see Krueger 1961: 153-155 for a short characterization); for its history see Levitskaja 1976: 73-75.

common sense, both the semantics of the 2nd preterit and the emergence of the copula following the participle (and finally becoming cliticized) are attributed to Chuvash influence. Serebrennikov saw this as an instance of divergence and was rather skeptical of direct Turkic influence (Serebrennikov 1960: 263) but for example Berezcki has propagated Chuvash influence on the emergence of the 2nd preterit in Mari (Berezcki 1984: 313)¹². According to him, a loan from Mari into Chuvash seems improbable: “Die umgekehrte Betrachtung der Erscheinung ist nicht möglich, da die Bildung der Vergangenheitsformen mit adverbialen Partizipia Präsens in den türkischen Sprachen üblich ist, während dieses Verfahren in den finno-ugrischen Sprachen unbekannt ist” (Berezcki 1984: 313). Also other researchers favor an explanation based on Turkic influence (Bartens 2000: 213-215).

Summing up the evidence, it is very likely, that the evidential usage of Mari’s 2nd preterit is of very recent origin. Although its etymological elements are of Finno-Ugric origin (Alhoniemi 1985: 111-112), Mari’s 2nd preterit is not based on a participle but on a construction *converb + copula*, and there is neither a typological nor an etymological possibility to connect this form to the Estonian evidential participle. Typologically, Mari’s 2nd preterit and the Estonian evidential participle became more finite, but there is a different story behind their origin. We are aware, that Metslang, Muižniece & Pajusalu 1999 did not explicitly claim that the Mari 2nd preterit and the Estonian evidential past participle are cognates, though there is a subliminal scent in their conclusion, stating a possible archaic feature.¹³

¹² It must be mentioned that Berezcki’s analysis of Mari’s 2nd preterit differs from Alhoniemi’s, although this has no impact on the argumentation presented here. Whereas Alhoniemi operates with a phonologically reduced form of the copula, which is attached to the *converb*, Berezcki analyzes these forms as “aus Personalpronomen abgeleitete Personalendungen” (Berezcki 1984: 313). Berezcki’s analysis not operating with a reduced copula looks problematic. In Western Mari dialects rests of the copula are preserved in plural paradigms. As we are not engaging in dialectological problems of Mari we refer to this shortcoming, but, as has already been stressed, this has no impact on our argumentation.

¹³ “The previous discussion indicates that in Estonian and Latvian both the functions of the past participle predicate without an auxiliary verb and the

3.3. The Permic languages' 2nd past

We will turn now to the more distant related languages Udmurt and Komi.¹⁴ The overall structure of the Permic past tense systems is basically the same as in Mari or Finnic; both Udmurt and Komi have a “verbal” 1st past which uses the already encountered past tense marker *-j* (with the known exceptions in the 2nd conjugation of Udmurt) and an “infinite” 2nd past which is based on a deverbal noun based on the suffix *-m(a)* accompanied with the corresponding possessive suffixes.¹⁵ Also several compound pasts are known (Bartens 2000, Leinonen, Vilkkuna 2000, Siegl 2004).

The following examples demonstrate the usage of 1st and 2nd past in standard literary Komi (4), (5) and Udmurt (6), (7):

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(4) <i>Коля локтіс</i> Kolja come-PSTI-3SG ‘Kolja came’</p> | <p>(5) <i>Коля тӧрыт локтӧм</i> Kolja yesterday come-PSTII-3SG ‘Kolja arrived yesterday’ or ‘Kolja is said to have arrived yesterday’ or ‘As it turns out, Kolja arrived yesterday’ or ‘To my surprise Kolja arrived yesterday’</p> |
| <p>(6) <i>Коля лыкти</i> Kolja came-PSTI-3SG ‘Kolja came’</p> | <p>(7) <i>Коля чукасе лыктэм</i> Kolja yesterday come-PSTII.3SG see (5)</p> |

course of finitization are in many respects surprisingly similar. These similarities cannot be explained only by late contacts between the neighboring languages. In the case of both languages the starting point is the ancient trends of the language family in the use of participles at the time when the finite and non-finite uses had not yet been clearly distinguished. While being on the periphery of the language family and coming into contact with each other over a long period of time, there have been both mutual influences and influences from third languages.” (Metslang, Muižniece & Pajusalu 1999: 149-150).

¹⁴ Zyrian and Permiak Komi are treated here as dialects of a single language, not as independent languages.

¹⁵ This is not always the case in Komi dialects in which the singular is not marked by any marker and the plural receives adjective plural markers.

The main difference between Komi and Udmurt lies in the frequency and distribution of the 2nd past. In Udmurt, the 2nd past is the default choice for narration¹⁶, a function almost absent from Komi (Leinonen 2000, Siegl 2004). In Komi, the 2nd past is used for “framing” traditional narratives (Siegl 2004: 98, 99-100, 108-109, 129-130); traditional narratives may start with several sentences in 2nd past, but then the perspective switches and the narration continues with either 1st past or present tense.¹⁷ This initial look on frequency and distribution of the Permic 2nd past might seem to support the argumentation of Metslang, Muižniece & Pajusalu, but a closer look at the history of the 2nd past speaks against it.

3.3.1. The morphology of the Permic 2nd past

A fair amount of problems concerning the structure of the 2nd past has been its highly irregular morphology, variation in 1st person marking or absence of 1st person forms at all. Although the 2nd past is morphologically nounish (clearly visible in negation), it nevertheless behaves syntactically like verb. However, it is not possible to address this problem in more detail here and we refer to Bartens (2000: 202-207) and Siegl (2004: 17-24) for a thorough discussion. En passant, this problem will be referred to in 3.3.4. albeit from a historical perspective.

¹⁶ A closer look on Udmurt folklore texts (Fuchs & Munkacsi 1954) verifies this claim:

| Chapter | ∑ of texts | ∑ of texts in 2 nd past | ∑ of texts in present and 1 st past |
|-----------------------------|------------|------------------------------------|--|
| I Aus dem Volksglauben | 59 | 54 | 5 |
| III Bärenkult und Jagdleben | 23 | 19 | 4 |

¹⁷ The fact, that the usage of the 2nd past differs quite extensively within the Permic languages was already stated by Wiedemann in 1885: “Der Gebrauch des Nomens auf *-m* für das Präteritum ist auch ein doppelter, ebenfalls im Wotjakischen viel ausgebreiteter als im Syrjänischen.” (Wiedemann 1885: 165).

3.3.2. The usage of the 2nd past¹⁸

The semantics of the 2nd past is fairly uniform; it is used almost entirely in declarative sentences.¹⁹ Beside the basic anterior (perfect) usage, it can be used as a means for expressing hearsay and inferential judgments, also a mirative usage (see DeLancey 1997) is possible. According to Aikhenvald's typology (Aikhenvald 2004: 26-29), the Permian 2nd past exhibits an evidential shading of type A1 ('Firsthand and Non-firsthand').

3.3.2.1. The distribution of the 2nd past in Komi

The basic usage of the 2nd past is its anterior usage (8). This is the usual perfect-like interpretation when a past situation is significant for the present situation (Bybee et al 1994: 54):

- (8) *no nɟlʒs kulɟma nin, oz lolav.*
 But girl-PX3SG die-PSTII-3SG²⁰ already, NEG-NEG-PST.3SG breath-CONN
 'But the girl was already dead, she did not breathe any longer'
 [LVy 137; 216]²¹

¹⁸ Based on Siegl 2004 (chapter 8).

¹⁹ In Komi, where there are finite dependent clauses, the second past can be found in those clauses too.

²⁰ The attributive markers in Komi PSTII 3rd person forms are glossed throughout our examples as Vx.3SG. Whereas this is questionable from a morphological perspective, the syntactic function of these morphemes is clearly connected to 3rd person marking. The same applies for the predicative plural marker used for plural. Further on, all 2nd past endings in upcoming Komi and Udmurt examples are glossed as the appropriate Vx. Although this contradicts underlying morphological forms in several cases, we approach this question from a syntactic perspective. We are fully aware of this shortcoming, but we are unable to offer any better solutions for glossing.

²¹ All upcoming Komi examples are taken from Uotila's texts. The original source has been encoded [dialect; text; page] but can easily be identified by using the glossary in the appendix. Due to typographic limitations, several diacritics (mainly on vowels) are missing in the examples, although this does not affect our argumentation.

All other possible meanings such as inferential (9), (10); hearsay (=2nd hand knowledge) (11), (12); mirative (13) are extensions of the anterior meaning:

- (9) *me ešša ad'd'ži lola kok-tuji. seti munemaš lola kekjà-mjs kj-mjn.*
 I then see-PSTI-1SG elk track. there go-PSTII-3PL elk eight about.
 ‘Then I saw elk tracks. About eight elks **must have run** there.’
 [LVy 176; 296]

- (10) *mžž:k t'set't'sas dod'd'is, boštas rut's kijas,*
 man get_down-FUT.3SG sledge-ELA, take-FUT.3SG fox hand-ILL3PX,
šuv'g: "ne važen ku'ema, žššg šonjt"
 say-3SG: not long-INST die-PSTII-3SG still warm
 ‘The man gets down from his sledge, takes the fox in his hand and says:
 “**He must have died recently**, (the body) is still warm.”’ [PS 94; 196]

- (11) *et'ikjš sijg izema mel'ni't'sajn. a kodjr sļen*
 once he grind-PSTII-3SG mill-INE. and as he-GEN
izšis, seki vėli jona pemjd daj sijg kol't't'sgema
 grind-PSTI-3SG, then be-PSTI-3SG very dark and he stay-PSTII-3SG
užnj set't'sg.
 sleep-INF there-ILL.
 ‘Once he **grounded** (grain) in the mill. And as his grains were grounded
 it was very dark and he **stayed** there to sleep’ [MS 41; 64]

- (12) *nijg koššisg kjk vun vaiš. si bėrjn tol'ko*
 they search-PSTI-3PL two days water-ELA. This after-INST only
ad'd'žisg. ed'd'e-n voemaš noštėmeš, bjdes
 find-PSTI-3PL. very be-PSTII-3PL ugly-PL, all
pjktėmeš.
 become-swollen-PSTII-3PL.
 ‘For two days one was searching for them in the water. Then, they **were found**. They were very ugly and **became swollen**.’ [PS 142; 246]

- (13) *no-pe, taj-ke-pe vijas, te-pe poljš veļemjd.*
 so_EVIP, this_when_EVIP kill-FUT.3SG, you_EVIP coward-PX3SG be-PSTII-2SG
 ‘This (bear) almost killed me, **and you were** [turned out to be] a
 coward’ [Pe 164; 226]

3.3.2.2. Udmurt

Also in Udmurt, the basic usage of the 2nd past is its anterior usage as presented in (14).²²

- (14) *njlme* *šotiško* *val.* *kaljk* *lač'ak* *šuldjraško:*
 girl-ACC.PX3SG give-PRS.1SG be.PSTI. people many amuse-PRS.3SG:
šuan *bere šuan* *ni. vaň* *rodňami* *l'ukaškemjn,*
 wedding once wedding PRT. be.PRS family-PX1PL gather-PSTII.PTCP-INE,
stanciš *pije* *gine bertjnte* – *jel* *nusa*
 station-ELA son-PX1SG still **return-PSTII-3SG-CAR** milk bring-CONV
mjniz *val.*
 go-PSTI-3SG be-PSTI

'I married off my daughter. A lot of people (came), they all were happy: a wedding is a wedding. The whole family has gathered, only my son **has not yet returned** from the station. He delivered the milk' [PM Kez 24;196]

As for Udmurt, all other possible meanings such as inferential (15), hearsay (=2nd hand knowledge) (16) and mirative (17) are extensions of the anterior meaning.

- (15) *kema gine* *mon otjn* *kjl'iskem.* *mame* *užantjš*
 long I there-INE **lie-PSTIIP.1SG.** mother-PX1SG work-ELA
vuem *no* *ažž'em.* *pe: gid* *ažjn* *mon*
return-PSTII.3SG and **see-PSTII.3SG,** EVIP: pen front-INE I
kjl'iško. *žo:gak* *pjlatem* *no korka* *pjrtem.* *noš*
 lie-PRS.1SG. quick **splash-PSTII.3SG** and house **bring-PSTII.3SG.** but
kjnmesam *al'i* *ke* *no pusez* *vaň* *na.*
 forehead-INE.1SG now when but mark-DET be.PRS.3SG still.

'I was lying there for quite a while. My mother returned from work and saw: I lie in front of the pen. Quickly she splashed me (with some water) and took me into the house. But on my forehead, there is still a mark.' [VM U; 37; 212]

- (16) *gražda-nskoj* *vojna* *djra* *gurtjn ulišjos* *koškil'am* *ňuleskj.*
 civil war during village inhabitant-PL **go-PSTII.3PL** forest-ILL.

²² Udmurt examples come from Saarinen & Kel'makov 1994. The same principles as for the Komi examples apply.

otjn vjlem jun kuž no paškjt nukez. gurtazj
 there-INE **be-PSTII.3SG** very long and wide ravine-DET. village-INE-PX3PL
ńeno-kjče životez no evėń kel'til'ŧam, č'i-stozes
 nothing cattle-DET and **NEG-EXIST** stay-PSTII.3PL, clean-ACC
šgrazj nuil'ŧam.
 strange-INE.PX3PL **take-along-PSTII.3PL.**

‘During the civil war, all villagers **went** to the forest. There **was** a very large and wide ravine. **They did not leave** any cattle in the village, **they took** everything along.’ [PM Kez 23;194]

- (17) *so mone vu ule pjrtiz. otjn no sooslen muzjem*
 he I.ACC water down bring-PSTI-3SG. there-INE so they-GEN ground
vjljn kad'ik ulonzj vjlem. vu uljn mone
 on-INE such life-PX3SG **be-PSTII.3SG**. water down-PP I.ACC
šudiz no jžjn kosiz.
 serve-PSTI-3SG and sleep-INF order-PSTI-3SG

‘He (=water-spirit) took me under water. There **they have** a life (lit: was a life) as (there is) on earth. I was served food and (he) told me to sleep’ [PM Glaz 6; 168]

3.3.3. The development of the evidential shading

Anteriors and resultatives have the semantic strength to develop into evidentials and this is a cross-linguistically wide spread phenomenon (Bybee et al. 1994; Lazard 1999; Lindstedt 2000). For Udmurt it was recently claimed (Winkler 2001) that the 2nd past should be considered to be a mood, also for Komi a similar claim, though less explicit, was made (Leinonen 2002: 200). The result of Siegl’s corpus study (Siegl 2004: 162) was the finding, that the 2nd past is no proper evidential, the evidential interpretation is based on an extension of its anterior meaning. Permic has no grammaticalized evidential system, because the function of the 2nd past is not exclusively a means for indicating evidentiality; it still behaves as a perfect-like category. There is no one to one mapping of form to function, because due to their tight semantic connection the temporal and the evidential function are not mutually exclusive. The fact that evidentiality in Permic occurs only in past tense is not a sufficient criteria for or against an evidential interpretation but the clear form to function mismatch is the main criterion, which speaks against an evidential interpretation. Although for

example Swedish and Sanskrit perfects can receive a noneyewitnessed interpretation, nobody would consider these secondary readings as instances of grammaticalized evidentiality (Lindstedt 2000: 376; Whitney 1964 § 821; Lazard 1999: 98 for a similar statement on Persian, Armenian and Georgian) and this is the case in Permian too. Siegl's result did not contradict but enhanced Leinonen's interpretation (2000: 436), which attributed evidentiality in Permian to the particles *ko: pe*, ud: *pe* and the 2nd past participle of 'to be' *ko: velem*²³, ud: *vjlem*.

3.3.4. The 1st person problem – a challenge to reconstruction

The 2nd past in standard written Komi lacks forms for 1st person singular and plural; also the forms for 1st person singular and plural in Udmurt are morphologically irregular. This has led to two central questions: a) whether the 2nd past ever knew a full paradigm, which included forms for 1st persons and b) whether the 2nd past is an inner Permian invention or inherited from an older proto-language (Bartens 2000, Csúcs 2001, Serebrennikov 1960, 1963). First we approach these questions traditionally.

Although the majority of Komi and Udmurt dialects have forms for 1st persons, they are probably of young origin. Komi dialects, which know a full paradigm usually transferred 3rd person forms to 1st person (for a comparative approach see Siegl 2004: 45-52). In Udmurt, the appearance of the present tense marker *-šk-* as a stem formant for the 2nd past stem in 1st person forms clearly demonstrates that this form cannot be old either. Still, two dialects at the opposite side of the Permian area have a complete paradigm, namely the Udora dialect of

²³ In several texts, besides *velem* a form *velem-ke* could be found. The later copula consists of the verb 'to be' and an interrogative article *ke* which nowadays is a suffix expressing indefiniteness e.g. *korke* 'at some time'. According to Leinonen 2000, *velem* and *velem-ke* are not synonymous in literary Komi, although in our data we did not encounter any differences in meaning.

Komi and the Bavly subdialect of Southern Udmurt²⁴ (Sorvačova & Beznosikova 1990: 67-68; Kel'makov & Saarinen 1994: 133). From a historical perspective these instances are highly interesting, though unfortunately the semantics are unknown. If the "lateral area" principle is correct and both forms are not instances of a secondary development, forms for 1st person might have existed earlier. This traditional approach however is not of any help.

Another possible step would be a historical-philological approach, but the lack of older sources for Komi and Udmurt makes this step impossible. The few existing old Permian texts contain only 3rd person forms (Lytkin 1952: 113).

We now turn to an approach based on diachronic typology and grammaticalisation theory. Cross-linguistically anteriors often develop into evidentials (Bybee et al 1994: 97). This development is not straight; usually anteriors develop first into resultatives or perfects (in the sense of Lindstedt 2000), which then develop an evidential meaning. As has been shown earlier, the evidential shading of the 2nd past can be derived from the perfect-like meaning and this has several consequences. As even nowadays the 2nd past still operates as a perfect-like category, one should assume that 1st person forms must have been known earlier too. The growth of the evidential strength of the 2nd past in the past could have led to the loss of 1st person forms in several Komi and Udmurt dialects, but seemingly the evidential shading did not generalize and the perfect remained in co-use. In a later stage, first person forms were reintroduced; in Komi 3rd person forms were transferred to 1st person, in Udmurt a new irregular²⁵ form for 1st person arose. This chain also introduced the concept of non-volitional usage in 1st person.²⁶ It could be possible that the loss of 1st person forms might have taken place in Proto-Permic and the reemergence of 1st person forms happened after the break-up of Proto-Permic into individual languages. However, typologically there is no sound reason

²⁴ And possibly also the Southern Udmurt Krasnoufim dialect (Kel'makov & Saarinen 1994: 133)

²⁵ Irregular at least from a morphological point of view.

²⁶ The concept of non-volition is used in the same way as in Leinonen 2001.

to assume that 1st persons would have been unknown in Proto-Permic (as assumed by Csúcs 2001). Serebrennikov's idea (1963: 258-259) that the evidential component of the 2nd past is an independent innovation in both Komi and Udmurt seems unlikely too. The evidential strength of perfects would make this interpretation theoretically possible but Udmurt and Komi are genetically too closely related and an interpretation based on common heritage seems more convincing.

Still, the typological approach has no answer for question b), namely whether the 2nd past has been a Permic innovation or became inherited from an earlier proto language. At least for the purpose of our article, this is of no concern.

3.3.5. The 2nd past as an instance of finitization and as a counter-example

The differences between the finitization of the Permic 2nd past and the Estonian past participle evidential can be summarized as follows: first, although the Permic 2nd past is used in narratives, this usage is restricted to Udmurt only. Second, although the finitization of the past participle in Komi and Udmurt has parallels in other eastern Finno-Ugric languages, the narrative usage and its semantics have clear parallels in the neighboring Turkic languages.²⁷ Third, the evidential usage of the 2nd past in Permic is not of old age either and again, this links the Permic 2nd past typologically to Turkic, where the evidential extension of the perfect is not attested in Proto-Turkic but only in younger stages of the family. Still, the evidential extension of the perfect is widely spread throughout Turkic (Johanson 2001).

3.4. The situation in contemporary Mordvin

So far we have shown that the evidential shadings of the Mari preterit as well as the 2nd past in Udmurt and Komi are of relatively young age. This finding has several consequences from a historical-comparative point of view. Although the exact historical grouping of

²⁷ In this case Udmurt stands closer to Turkic than Komi.

Mari and Mordvin within Finno-Permic remains unsolved, it is generally agreed that Mordvin stands closer to (Balto)-Finnic than Mari. Still, Mordvin does not offer anything which could support the argumentation of Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu. According to Bartens' descriptions (Bartens 1979: 74-76; Bartens 1999) infinite predicative constructions are not used as evidentials or narratives in Mordvin.

3.5. The Saami languages

The situation in Saami needs a differentiated approach. It is known that Southern Saami and several eastern Saami varieties form the perfect with a participle without a copula (Korhonen 1981: 302-304; Bergsland 1994: 46-47) and usually this is considered to be an archaic feature (Korhonen 1981: 303). From this starting point, a superficial parallel between Estonian and several Saami languages does exist, though after a closer look, also this evidence does not support Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu's argumentation.

The usage of the perfect in the Saami languages is principally unified.²⁸ Generally it is used to refer to past events which have a certain impact for ongoing events. The following examples show both the structure and the usage of the perfect in both Northern Saami (18) and Southern Saami (19):

- (18) *Mun lean giessan báhpira sisa dan bohtala.*
 I be-1SG wrap-PST.PTCP paper-GEN in-ADV this-ACC bottle-ACC
 'I have wrapped the bottle in paper' (Nickel 1990: 457)

- (19) *Læjsa tjaaleme.*
 Lisa write-PST.PTCP
 'Lisa has written' (Bergsland 1994: 46)

According to Bergsland, the Southern Saami perfect can be accompanied by the copula, though in these cases, the outcome receives a special emphatic stress:

²⁸ The tense system of Saami is typologically the same as in Finnic.

- (20) *Laara lea b̄aateme.*
 Lars be.3SG come-PST.PTCP
 ‘Lars **has** come’ (Bergsland 1994: 46)²⁹

A short look at Bergsland’s Røros Saami texts (Bergsland 1943) reveals that the perfect is used rather infrequently, also in traditional narratives. Elder texts by Lagercrantz (1957) back up this assertion. The same holds for Northern Saami. This means that although several Saami languages have perfects, which structurally resembles the Estonian bare past participle, their usage does not show anything which might back up the argument of Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu.³⁰

3.6. Summing up the evidence from the Finno-Permic branch

Which conclusions can be drawn from our survey? First, the Finnic *-nUt* participle is an innovation without any etymological cognates in other related languages (Korhonen 1973: 178; Hakulinen 1979: 215; Laanest 1982: 235). Second, Mari’s 2nd preterit is a recent functional loan from Chuvash, which is not even based on a participle but on a converb. Third, the 2nd past is used in Permic as a narration strategy only in Udmurt; Komi does not follow this pattern. When Komi uses a 2nd past in narration, it is used as a framing method in the onset of a narrative before narration switches to either 1st past or present tense. Overall, the semantic parallels between the Permic languages and the Turkic languages are striking and a certain kind of areal interference must be assumed. This also means that in both the Mari and the Permic case, evidentials seem to be another instance of interference with surrounding Turkic languages and not an instance of an archaism. Our alternative reconstruction for the 2nd past in Permic points into this direction too. Based on grammaticalization theory and diachronic

²⁹ The same behavior can be observed with Southern Saami progressives (see Bergsland 1994: 46).

³⁰ Although the tense system of Saami and Finnic are typologically very close, the Saami perfect participle is not a cognate of the Finnic *-nUt* participle. The Saami participle is etymologically linked to the Mordvin and Permic *-m* element which is a formative of verbal nouns and participles, but an evidential meaning can be attributed to the Permic past only.

typology, we arrived at the conclusion that the highly irregular 1st person morphology in contemporary Udmurt and Komi is of young origin. Initially, a fully productive perfect-like category which included 1st person forms developed a secondary evidential force which resulted in the loss of 1st person forms. However, this development did not result in a proper evidential, and, as the perfect-like usage was not abandoned, forms for 1st person were reintroduced (albeit as non-volitionals), which led to the situation attested in contemporary Komi and Udmurt.

Although several Saami languages use bare participles as perfects, their usage does not fit the semantics of their Estonian look-a-like, and, last but not least, also Mordvin has nothing comparable to Estonian. Summing up the evidence within the Finno-Permic branch of Finno-Ugric one has to conclude, that neither the more distantly related Permic languages and Mari nor the closer related Mordvin and Saami languages back up Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu's arguments. Evidential shadings of certain past tenses in Mari, Udmurt and Komi are of rather recent origin and cannot be connected to the Estonian MO.

4. THE EVIDENCE FROM BALTIC

The Lithuanian *oblique* and the Latvian *renarrated* mood, which are commonly called *modus relativus* (MR), are based on participles. As most of these participles are also used in the indicative, the distinctive feature of the Baltic evidential systems is the systematic lack of finite auxiliaries in predication. Another distinctive feature, characteristic only for Latvian, is the use of indeclinable present and future participles. While the Latvian evidential system is specifically quotative (Ceplīte & Ceplītis 1991: 73-74), the Lithuanian system³¹ codifies a larger scale of evidential meanings (Ambrazas 1997: 262-266). The degree of grammaticalness of evidentiality in the Baltic area decreases in the direction from the north to the south. MR is a systemic category

³¹ To be precise, there are two evidential systems in Lithuanian, the first one based on active and the second on passive participles (see Gronemeyer 1997). Here only the first one (*oblique mood*) is of concern.

in almost all Latvian dialects. In the ethnic Lithuanian territory, MR is restricted to the Žemaitian and West-Aukštaitian dialects. It is also found in the northeast corner of the present-day Lithuanian territory, near Latvian Latgale (Ambrazas 1990: 225). For Old-Prussian MR is not reconstructed, although there is some controversy in this respect (see Palmaitis 1989 and Schmalstieg 1992 for discussion). We will not discuss the peculiarities of the Baltic evidential systems in detail and will get straight to the question about the origin of the copula-less participial constructions as markers of evidentiality.

It seems that Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu have used Ambrazas (1990) as a basic reference source concerning the historical functional development of the participles in Baltic and in Indo-European in general. Pajusalu and Muižniece (1997: 96) write: “The past participle without an auxiliary used as predicate, e.g. ee *mees elanud Vōrus* [man tell-PST.PTCP Vōru-INE ‘it is told that a man has lived in Vōru’] is considered an old feature characteristic for both Finno-Ugric (see Künnap 1992: 173 ff.) and Indo-European (Ambrazas 1990: 187-188 ff.) languages” (translation P.K. and F.S). Ambrazas is referred also in the subsequent article (Metslang, Muižniece & Pajusalu 1999: 135, 138). One cannot argue that he is referred incorrectly. What remains unmentioned by Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu, however, is that Ambrazas does not see the source of the evidential use of the participles in the old narrative discourse *per se*, but in a certain type of constructions.

Ambrazas excludes the possibility that the representatives of MR for the present and single past tenses have come into existence via different routes and discusses the present and past participles in a single framework. His short overview of the previous work on the topic displays striking similarities with the reconstructions familiar from the works on the history of MO in Estonian. The basic body of literature dealing with the history of MR in Baltic (among others Delbrück, Endzelīns, Hofmann, Bense, and Tangl: see Ambrazas 1990: 222-223) sees the origin of the category in subordinating constructions such as *nominativus cum participio* and *accusativus cum participio*.

The contribution Ambrazas makes to the discussion is that he rejects the possibility that the MR, the type *nominativus cum participio*, and the later constructions with subordinating conjunction, are derivable from each other. This conjecture is very similar to the hypo-

thesis proposed by Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu (1999) concerning Estonian. Nevertheless, Ambrazas does not go as far as Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu do. He claims that all three types of construction derive from a common source – an old construction with participle functioning as a predicate of the subordinate clause (Ambrazas 1990: 227). Ambrazas assumes that in the Late Common Indo-European, the nominal forms of the verbs (which afterwards developed into participles) were marked forms in relation to their sphere of use – they were used mostly in subordination. In this respect, they differed from the finite verb forms. As it is difficult to reconstruct any strictly grammatical means of subordination (such as special subordinating conjunctions) for Indo-European, it is assumed that the subordination was expressed by participles and infinitives. In other words, in Indo-European the function of the missing syntactically subordinate clause was expressed by a nominal sentence (Ambrazas 1990: 236-237). Ambrazas writes that the evidence from Baltic supports this assumption. In Baltic, the participles without auxiliary are nowadays especially frequent in subordinated clauses (ibid. 216-217), and this restriction in use seems to be even more striking in old written sources of Lithuanian and Latvian (ibid. 224-225). Additional proof for the close relationship between these subordinating construction and the evidential uses of the participles is provided by the fact that the areas of distribution of MR and the type *nominativus cum participio* basically overlap both in Lithuanian and in the Latvian dialect territory (Ambrazas 1990: 225).

Ambrazas arrives at the conclusion that the development succeeded from subordination to obliqueness and reported evidentiality, i.e. from the general meaning of subordination (secondary predication) to the more specific meaning of evidentiality. More specifically, he believes that the genesis of MR was boosted by the widespread uses of active participles after PCU-verbs (Ambrazas 1990: 238). Seeing the main source of evidentiality in subordination, he does not however eliminate the possible influence of the forms of perfect: “The comparison with other languages that have similar modal categories helps to understand the genesis of MR in Lithuanian better. Its structural grounds are provided by the ancient predicative use of the participles in subordinate clauses. Its semantic preconditions are related to the tendency for modal reanalysis of participles, especially in the peri-

phrastic forms of the perfect.” (Ambrazas 1990: 235, translation P.K. and F.S.).

One can observe that Ambrazas is putting strong emphasis on the role of secondary predication as a possible source of evidentiality. His argumentation can be summed up with the following scheme:

Functional development of the active participle in Baltic (according to Ambrazas 1990)

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| unmarked secondary predication | → | association with (a) grammaticalized patterns of secondary predication and (b) compound tense forms | → | evidentiality coding in main predication |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|--|

Regarding the age of the MR in Baltic, Ambrazas suggests the V–VI A.D. as a starting point for the genesis of this category (Ambrazas 1990: 232).

Leaving Ambrazas behind, we will focus on more recent works that deal with the history of MR in Baltic: Wälchli (2000) and Holvoet (2004, to appear 2007).

In contrast to Ambrazas, Wälchli is convinced that the starting point for the process of grammaticalization of evidentiality in the languages of the Baltic area (Lithuanian, Latvian, Livonian and Estonian) is a perfect tense. This is based on the observation that these languages do not always exhibit regular formal difference between the perfect and the evidential past. This is especially true for Lithuanian, where, due to the common absence of the copula ‘to be’, indicative perfect and evidential past are often only contextually differentiated. Since the past time reference is within the nucleus of the typological category of evidentiality, Wälchli assumes also that in the languages of the Baltic area evidential past developed earlier than evidential present. He presents very convincing evidence in support of his assumptions.

In Lithuanian, a language in which evidentiality is grammaticalized to a lesser degree and only in some dialects fairy tales are told in indicative simple past. In this feature Lithuanian differs from Latvian and Estonian, where fairy tales are often told in evidential past (Wälchli 2000: 192). However, legends of origin are told in evidential

past (= indicative perfect without copula) also in Lithuanian, and Wälchli believes that this is not accidental. In the legends of origin, the reported events are tied to the present. The present state of affairs (people find different things) is the result of what is said to have happened. In addition, there is often a frame of the story in the present (is, find). The use of the perfect is thus warranted by one of its basic functions: to express a past event with current relevance. Besides the common resemblance in form, a functional link between Lithuanian evidential and perfect is provided by the fact that the legends of origin present unique events, which points out to the experiential function of the perfect. Furthermore, in the Lithuanian legends of origin, an etiological narrative sequence begins in the evidential and is continued in the indicative (simple) past. Evidential past is used to narrate shorter inferred sequences in a frame of present tense (cf. the “framing” function of the Komi 2nd past). If the sequence is longer, a switch to past indicative follows. Similar discourse-marked connection between the evidential category and current relevance has been described for Bulgarian – a language with a historically attested shift from perfect to evidential (Roth 1979: 151).

Thus, the genre distribution of the Lithuanian evidential as well as its placement in the discourse are a reminiscence of a certain stage of the development of an evidential category, where it is still closely linked to its source – the prototypical perfect (Wälchli 2000: 192-193).

In an article from 2004 and in a forthcoming monograph on mood and modality in Baltic, Axel Holvoet assumes the same path of development of the past participles into evidential markers as Wälchli.³² He derives the evidential past in Baltic from the perfect with a deleted auxiliary. Evidence in favor of such development is provided by the semantics of the Lithuanian and Latvian evidentials. It is obvious that formally the Lithuanian MR represents an earlier stage on the grammaticalization cline of evidentiality in Baltic. Semantically, the Lithuanian MR comprises quotative, inferential and mirative meanings, and reminds this way very much the evidentiality systems of the Balkan languages. On the other hand, the Latvian evidential is described only

³² The following reference is based also on personal communication with Mr. Holvoet.

as quotative. Since the development from inferential to quotative is attested in many languages in Eurasia, and the opposite direction is not attested, Holvoet assumes that also semantically Lithuanian displays a more genuine picture than Latvian does, and that the quotative specialization in Latvian is a secondary development. Considering that inferential is cross-linguistically a frequent semantic extension of the perfect, he finally comes to the path perfect > inferential > quotative.

5. METSLANG, MUIŽNIECE & PAJUSALU 1999 REVISITED

The final review of Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu's ideas will be carried on in three steps. First we will discuss some methodological problems of the paper, second we will synthesize the cross-linguistic concerns brought up in the previous chapters, and third, we will provide additional evidence from Estonian which speaks against their hypothesis.

To begin with the methodology of the paper by Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu, several shortcomings call for special attention. As a starting point, the authors assumed that the ancient function of the past participle was to express narrative past tense and constructed a semantic map, which demonstrated how the ancient narrative use could evolve into evidentiality and into other related functional domains. In the end of the chapter dealing with evidentiality, they write: "Thus, the quotative in the form of a participle has at least three possible sources: (1) the original participle predicate, (2) copula ellipsis in the compound indicative form, and (3) the participial construction." (p. 146). If this is to be understood as a taxonomy of grammaticalization paths, then one can reformulate it as follows: The quotative gram evolved (1) straight from the old use of the participle as a predicate or (2) was extracted from a grammatical construction with the quotative variant meaning. In the case of the past participle, the overall impression is that Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu consider the first path more likely. We insist, however, that the second path should be emphasized as the constructional history is the only key to the answer of the question of *why* quotative emerged as verbal category in Estonian. Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu state it clearly that their approach is form-centered (1999: 128). Taking form-centered ap-

proach, one can say that the present quotative marker in South Estonian *-v* (in *viskav*) and the 3Sg active present marker in Standard Estonian *-b* (in *viskab*) have emerged from the common source through series of regrammaticalizations. Although this account is sound, it is not explanatory as to why that happened, and thus, would be of interest only for historical phonologists. In the languages that we are aware of, the raise of evidentiality is a matter of reanalysis of the sequential structure of the sentence and should be calling out for concurrently syntactic and semantic explanations. Brian Joseph has addressed similar grammaticalization studies from a general perspective and identified a common shortcoming which characterizes also the argumentation of Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu who as others fell “into trap of treating a diachronic correspondence (the result of various processes/mechanisms of change) as being a diachronic process/mechanism; ...” (Joseph 2004: 56)

On page 144 of their article, Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu provide an elegant explanation why the ellipse of the auxiliary in compounds is not a possible path of development. The participle is subjected to the V2 rule in Estonian and this contradicts the interpretation that ellipse has taken place (compare between *Sa olevat eile teatris käinud* ‘You are said to have gone to the theater yesterday’, **Sa Ø eile teatris käinud*, and the grammatical *Sa käinud eile teatris*). However, this proof is not infallible. One should distinguish between the ellipse of the auxiliary and the lost of syntactic position. In the compound verb forms, there is a syntactic position for the auxiliary, even if it may be omitted. In evidential forms with bare past participle however, the syntactic position originally occupied by the auxiliary is lost. To put it differently, there may have been a process of syntactic reanalysis whereby the position of the finite auxiliary was taken over by the participle. Holvoet suggests this explanation for the similar developments in Baltic, and we do not see any reason why it could not be applied to the situation in Estonian. As the syntax is in a constant change, any word order arguments are not convincing, especially when a longer period is concerned.

In the previous chapters we demonstrated that, among the languages of relevance here, the past participles used as markers of evi-

dentiality are found either within the Turkic contact-area (in Permic) or reveal constructional history (in Baltic).³³ There is no reason to assume the preservation of an ancient feature if the genealogically based evidence does not support such a reconstruction, and, if in the neighboring Baltic languages, which share the feature, this is considered a comparatively late construction-based development. The lack of a grammatical MR in South Lithuanian, Old Prussian as well as in the majority of Finnic is very talkative concerning the age of the feature. Likewise, the situation in Eastern Finno-Ugric languages does not support the claim that the raise of evidentiality is a characteristic Finno-Ugric feature. Whereas there are clear structural similarities between the tense systems of Mari and Estonian (at least when regarding the fact, that a preterit is opposed by a perfect-like category), there is no chance to connect them to each other, simply because the Finnic perfect is not an etymological cognate of the Mari category, and the Mari category is of rather recent origin. Even if grammatical evidentials should be considered a congenital feature in some language family within Eurasia, the best candidate for such would be the Turkic family, from which evidentials have spread into several Non-Turkic languages (see Aikhenvald 2004: 289). As for the history of MR in Baltic, the only source used by Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu was Ambrazas, who was rather loosely interpreted by them. It was already shown in §4, that according to Ambrazas, the key to understanding the evidential uses of the participles are their original uses in the secondary predication, whether grammaticalized or not. Moreover, subsequent studies (Wälchli 2000 and Holvoet 2004, to appear 2007) certainly do not agree with Ambrazas and state that the most likely source of the evidential category in Baltic is the perfect tense.

There is another essential point along these lines. If the source of the category was the predicative use of the participles in ancient types of narratives, then one should expect the geographic area, where bare participles are used in traditional narratives to be larger or at least not to overlap with the area, where bare participles are used as evidential

³³ Although Mari is located in the Turkic contact area, it offers a third possibility, namely a converb based construction which is neither compatible with the Permic nor with the Baltic development.

markers. This is not the case, however. In Baltic, as well as in Finnic, these two areas generally overlap. In Lithuanian, in which evidentiality was grammaticalized only in the North and West (in the vicinity of Latvia), the participles are spread only in very restricted types of traditional narratives (legends of origin), the most exploited marking being indicative. As for Finnic, the situation is basically the same. In Finnish, traditional narratives are most often told using different tense forms of the indicative.

Summing up the cross-linguistic part of the discussion, it is clear that the evidence from Baltic, Permic and Mari cannot back up Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu's proposal, but on the contrary, it contradicts it.

So far, we have been addressing particular claims of Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu. Let us now have a look at the distribution of VPs in Estonian traditional narratives. In what follows, we will provide two pieces of evidence which do not speak in favour of the hypothesis of Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu.

First, one may ask how the evidential past participle is negated. Following Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu, one would say that, since the participle functions as a simple past tense, the negated form of the participle *käinud* (go-PST.PTCP), when used as an evidential predicate, will be *ei käinud* (NEG go-PST.PTCP), which is homonymic with the negation form of the imperfect indicative. We therefore had a closer look at traditional narratives to find out whether this is the case. Indeed, this pattern was found, but very often we found another pattern where the type *ei ole käinud* (NEG be go-PST.PTCP) stands for negation, e.g.:

- (21) *ühe koõra olnd jälle mîs ja naõne abi,elupâr.*
 one-GEN time-GEN be-PST.PTCP again man and woman marriage_couple
olnd neil üks veikke tuba veì saun mâ külle
 be-PST.PTCP they-ADE one small room or sauna hill-GEN side-GEN
sisse tehtud, tagumene kül'g olnd mâ külle
 in-ILL do-PST.PASS.PTCP back side be-PST.PTCP hill-GEN side-GEN
sîs, îs külles ol'li kaõtus piäl. Sis olnd
 then front side-INE be-IMPF.3SG roof above-ADE then be-PST.PTCP
naõtukke pelbu kâ, obest ei ole olnd, lehm
 little field-PART also horse-PART NEG be be-PST.PTCP cow

oľno *ja siga.*
 be-PST.PTCP and pig

‘Once there was (= was said to be) a married couple. They had (= were said to have) a small room or cottage build into the hill, the backside was (= was said to be) build into the hill and there was a roof on the front side. Then, there **was** (= **was said to be**) also a little spot of land, there **was no (PRF)** horse, there **was** (= **was said to be**) a cow and a pig.’ (Must 1965: 374-375)

In this example, the corresponding form of the participle for negation is the negative form of the compound tense form (perfect). Metslang and Pajusalu (2002) have already noticed such occurrences leaving them without explanation. In our opinion, examples like (21) provide proof for the existence of a close relationship in the speaker’s mind between the predicate in the form of the past participle and the compound tenses. However, we have to wait for a systematic corpus-study to find the answer to the question which of the alternative forms (NEG V-PST.PTCP or NEG be V-PST.PTCP) is the more frequent negative counterpart of the past participle. Our search through two volumes of *Eesti murded* (Keem & Käsi 2002 and Must 1965) and *Endis-Eesti elu-olu II* (Loorits 2004) was not exhaustive and therefore no reliable frequencies can be presented.

The second sort of evidence is provided by the past participles, which tend to get isolated from the forms of pluperfect and start functioning as main predicates in the story. Consider the following example:

- (22) *t̄sõru meizah_N oľ* *ka heř oľnu?* *sijš t̄j*
 tsooru manor-INE be-IMPF.3SG also master be-PST.PTCP then he
oľ *meřsavaht̄ga^p pahananu?* *eì: “mist̄^l jašt*
 be-IMPF.3SG ranger-PL-COM accuse-PST.PTCP that what 2PL let-PRS.2PL
varasta?!” sijš oľ *pañnu^h hobez̄e eite,*
 steal-INF then be-IMPF.3SG put-PST.PTCP horse.GEN before
oľ ež̄^k ka *vaht̄ma läñnu?* *eì meřsavahi? eì^l jahiⁿ noid*
 be-IMPF.3SG self also guard-INF go-PST.PTCP that ranger-PL NEG hunt those
meřsavařḡit̄, *eì ma^l lâ* *ež̄^v vaht̄ma. sijš n̄j?*
 wood_thief-PL-PART that I go-PRS.1SG self guard-INF then they
oľ^l t̄ tuñdmada^m mehe? *oľnu?* *n̄j^k kraβanu^k kiñni?* *uma*
 be-IMPF-3PL unknown man-PL be-PST.PTCP they seize-PST.PTCP off own

nõri *vẽnu^r riⁱ manⁱ* *ja* *pãnu^p pa^runi*
 roop-GEN take-PST.PTCP sledge.GEN from and put-PST.PTCP baron.GEN
sāni *perrä. talvel* *olnu?*
 sledge.GEN behind winter-ADE be-PST.PTCP

“There was a baron at the Tsooru manor. He was angry with the rangers: “Why do you let them steal!” Then, he had hitched up the horse and had gone to guard himself, being angry with the rangers for not hunting the wood thieves. There **had been (PLPRF)** strangers, who **had seized him off (= were said to have seized him off)**. They had taken (= were said to have taken) a rope from the sledge and fastened (= were said to have fastened) the baron behind the sledge. It was (= was said to have been) winter. ... (Keem & Käsi 2002: 334)

As can be seen, the first part of the story is narrated using pluperfect. At a certain stage however, the finite form of the auxiliary becomes redundant in its function to mark specific time reference in the discourse, and the past participle is rendered as an independent predicate. While the bolded and underlined verb form in the example is perceived as an elliptic, from the next sentence on, the past participle becomes a systematic form of the predicate. The fact that there is a NP between the auxiliary and the participle in the foregoing bolded form of pluperfect has obviously played a role in the mechanism which led to the isolation of the participle. Relying on iconicity principles one should expect, that in such cases, when auxiliary and participle are separated by other constituents, a switch of forms is more likely to occur. This kind of code-switch between compound tense and bare past participle is frequently attested, not only in traditional storytelling, but also in contemporary fiction. Consider again a part of example (1) repeated in (23).

- (23) *Kord oli üks naine, kelle pool ta Tartus oli*
 Once **be-IMPF.3SG** one woman who-GEN side she Tartu-INE be-IMPF.3SG
elanud, hakanud temaga rääkima marurikastest
 live-PST.PTCP **start-PST.PTCP** she-COM talk-INF madly_rich-PL-ELA
Ameerika juutidest. Naine teinud seda mõnevõrra
 America-GEN Jew-PL-ELA woman **do-PST.PTCP** it to_some_degree
halvustavalt
 contemptuously

‘There was a woman once, at whose place she was living in Tartu, who **had started** to tell her about all those madly rich American Jews. The

woman **had done** (= **was said to have done**) this with some contempt in her voice'

Here also, the imperfect form of the auxiliary is used to bind the event to the specific moment of reference. The reason for form switch to occur exactly in this place is that we do not only find a NP *üks naine* 'a woman', but also its extension – a longish relative clause, located between the auxiliary and the participle. This pattern of rendering an independent predicate by detaching a participle from the finite compounds is known also in Finnish (see the example in Grünthal 1941: 261), a language without grammaticalized evidentiality distinctions.

The mechanism of omission of the current relevance expression and conventionalizing the remaining expression (participle) as a main plot-advancing device provides satisfactory explanation for the entire phenomenon. Koptjevskaja-Tamm & Wälchli (2001: 723), for example, point out to the tendency to use the perfect forms with overt auxiliary at the beginning of tales. A possible explanation is that the overt marking of the current relevance is always necessary there in order to bind the following chain of events to the specific moment of reference. The scope of the current relevance expression reaches far behind the first predication unit of the tale. As a result, the auxiliary is perceived redundant in the following sentences. Furthermore, at some point, the whole clause containing expression of current relevance may be omitted. Any folktale starting with *Elanud kord...* (live-PST.PTCP once...) and continuing with the bare past participles used throughout the narrative could be seen just as a large passage embedded in the main clause *räägitakse, et...* (tell-PRS.PASS, that...), which afterwards is omitted.

Many questions may be addressed to Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu if we turn our attention to the semantics of the Estonian evidential. It remains to be explained how present and past participles that have both acquired such a narrow function as quotative, happen to originate in so different sources, the present participle originating in subordinating construction, the past participle in an ancient monologic type of discourse. Or else, shall we extend their hypothesis to the development of present participles into markers of evidentiality. If so, what is the link between the present participle and the ancient mono-

logic storytelling? These follow up questions are highly justified but remain unanswered (perhaps even unanswerable) in the framework proposed by Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu. Both neglected possibilities (auxiliary-ellipse, PCU-construction reanalysis) do not lead to such problems and one may ask why Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu have favored an analysis, whose follow up imposes such problems.

6. CONCLUSIONS

This paper was aimed as a response to Metslang, Muižniece and Pajusalu (1999) who advocated a lineal development from an ancient use of participles as predicates into their use as evidentials. Their reconstruction was based on certain structural resemblances between the Estonian evidential past participle, the 2nd preterit in Mari, and the evidential past participles in Baltic languages. Summing up the evidence presented in this paper, there are good reasons, which speak against this reconstruction.

Despite the formal resemblances of the Estonian and Mari past tense systems, the Estonian evidential past participle and Mari's 2nd preterit differ quite radically from each other both in terms of functional dedication and semantics. Although not yet proven, Mari's 2nd preterit seems to be past tense with an additional evidential shading of Aikhenvald's type A1, whereas Estonian's bare participle functions as an evidential proper of type A3. The semantics of the Mari 2nd preterit is typologically very close to the Permic 2nd past. The 2nd past in Permic is not a proper evidential but must be considered an evidential strategy of type A1 (Siegl 2004). As a possibly relevant point, it was argued that the most appealing solution of the so called 1st person problem in Permic is to assume a straightforward diachronic relation between the Permic 2nd past and a perfect-like category.

The strongest argument against the linking of the Estonian evidential past participle to the Mari 2nd preterit is the fact that Mari's 2nd preterit was formed under Chuvash influence. Both in Mari and in Permic the narrative uses and evidential extensions of the 2nd pasts seem to be due to the long lasting contact with Turkic languages which exhibit the same structural and semantic patterns of eviden-

tiality. The semantics of Mari's 2nd preterit and the Estonian evidential past participle do not match and neither does their history.

As for Baltic, most of the research conducted before Ambrazas (1990) is inclined towards a PCU-complementation hypothesis, whereas the later studies tend towards compound tense origin (= auxiliary-ellipse hypothesis). Furthermore, it was demonstrated that the new reconstruction adapted Ambrazas' claims speculatively and actually went beyond them.

Also internal evidence from Estonian is inconsistent with the new reconstruction. First, the negated form of the evidential bare participle is often identical with the negated form of compound tenses, and second, the bare participle is often "extracted" from compounds. Both pieces of evidence show that the evidential past participle is closely associated with compound tenses and not with the simple past as should be expected if the finite use of the participle is derived from its ancient use as predicate.

Finally, an overall methodological problem of the new reconstruction is the manner in which it is argued for. This involves historicizing of synchronic data without linking different steps of semantic reanalysis with the syntactic structure of the sentence. It was shown that such an atomistic approach to a linguistic element could by no means provide a historical insight to the role that the element has played within the language system.

Abbreviations

1 – first person, 2 – second person, 3 – third person, ABL – ablative case, ACC – accusative, ADE – adessive case, ADV – adverb, ALL – allative case, CAR – caritative, COM – comitative case, CONV – converb, CONNEG – connegative, DET – determiner, ELA – elative case, ENCL – enclitic, ESS – essive, EVIP – evidential particle, FUT – future, GEN – genitive case, ILL – illative case, IMP – imperative, IMPF – imperfect tense, INE – inessive case, INF – infinitive, INST – instrumental, NEG – negation marker, NEG-EXIST – negative existential (suppletive stem), NEGV – negation verb, MO – *modus obliquus*, MR – *modus relativus*, PART – partitive case, PASS – passive (impersonal) voice, PL – plural, PP – postposition, PRS – present, PRT – particle, PST – past, PTCP – participle, PX – possessive suffix, SG – singular, V – verb, VX – verbal ending

Komi dialects

LVy – Lower Vyčegda, PS – Southern Permyak, MS – Middle Sysola,
Pe – Pečora

Udmurt dialects

PM – Northern dialect, VM – Central dialect

Textual material

FUCHS Dávid R., 1952, *Volksbräuche und Volksdichtung der Wotjaken aus dem Nachlasse von Bernhard Munkácsi*, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 102, Helsinki.

KEEM Hella, KÄSI Inge, 2002, *Võru murde tekstid*, Eesti Murded VI, Tallinn.

KEL'MAKOV Valentin, SAARINEN Sirkka, 1994, *Udmurtin murteet*, Turun yliopiston suomalaisen ja yleisen kielitieteen laitoksen julkaisuja, 47, Turku.

KOKKONEN Paula, 1985, *Syrjänische Texte, Band I Komi-Permjakisch*, gesammelt von T. E. Uotila, übersetzt und herausgegeben von Paula Kokkonen, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 186, Helsinki.

KOKKONEN Paula, 1986, *Syrjänische Texte, Band II Komi-Syrjänisch: Ižma-, Pečora- und Vym-Dialekte*, gesammelt von T. E. Uotila, übersetzt und herausgegeben von Paula Kokkonen, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 193, Helsinki.

KOKKONEN Paula, 1989, *Syrjänische Texte, Band III Komi-Syrjänisch: Luza-Letka-, Ober-Sysola-, Mittel-Sysola-, Prissyktyvkar-, Unter-Vyčegda- und Udora-Dialekte*, gesammelt von T. E. Uotila, übersetzt und herausgegeben von Paula Kokkonen, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 202, Helsinki.

LOORITS Oskar, 2004, *Endis-Eesti elu-olu II : Lugemispalu metsaehust ja jahindusest*, Eesti rahvaluule arhiivi toimetised, 21 (15), Tartu : Eesti Kirjandusmuuseum.

MUST Mari, 1965, *Keskmurde tekstid*, Eesti Murded II, Tallinn.

PILTER Lauri, 2004, *Lohejas pilv*, Tallinn : Tuum.

REFERENCES

- AIKHENVALD Alexandra Y., 2003, “Evidentiality in typological perspective”, in AIKHENVALD A. Y., DIXON R. M. W. (eds.), *Studies in Evidentiality*, Typological Studies in Language, 54, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: Benjamins, 1-31.
- AIKHENVALD Alexandra Y., 2004, *Evidentiality*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- AIRILA Martti, 1935, “Viron kielen *oratio obliqua*’sta”, *Suomi*, 5 (17), Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- ALHONIEMI Alho, 1985, *Marin kielioppi*, Apuneuvoja suomalais-ugrilaisien kielten opintoja varten, X, Helsinki.
- ALVRE Paul, 1993, “Anmerkungen zum obliquen Modus im Estnischen und Livischen”, *Linguistica Uralica*, XXIX, 95-104.
- AMBRAZAS Vytautas, 1990, *Сравнительный синтаксис причастий балтийских языков – Vergleichende Syntax der baltischen Partizipien*, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- AMBRAZAS Vytautas (ed.), 1997, *Lithuanian Grammar*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- BARTENS Raija, 1979, *Mordvan, tšeremissin ja votjakin konjugaation infinitiisten muotojen syntaksi*, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 170, Helsinki.
- BARTENS Raija, 1981, “Suomalais-ugrilaisen kantakielen muoto- ja lauserakenteesta”, *Virittäjä*, 85, 101-108.
- BARTENS Raija, 1999, *Mordvalaiskielten rakenne ja kehitys*, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 232, Helsinki.
- BARTENS Raija, 2000, *Permiläisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys*, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 238, Helsinki.
- BERECZKI Gábor, 1984, “Die Beziehungen zwischen den finnougriechen und türkischen Sprachen im Wolga-Kama Gebiet”, *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*, 86, 307-314.
- BERGSLAND Knut, 1943, *Røros-samiske tekster*, Nordnorske samlinger utgitt av etnografisk museum, II, Oslo.
- BERGSLAND Knut, 1994, *Sydsamisk grammatikk*, 2. Utgave, Vaasa: Davvi Girji.
- BYBEE Joan, PERKINS Revere, PAGLIUCIA William, 1994, *The Evolution of Grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*, Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.
- CAMPBELL Lyle, HARRIS Alice C., 1995, *Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 74, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- CAMPBELL Lyle, 1991, "Some grammaticalization changes in Estonian and their implications", in TRAUOGOTT Elizabeth Closs, HEINE Bernd (eds.), *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, Typological Studies in Language, 19, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 285-299.
- CEPLĪTE Brigita, CEPLĪTIS Laimdota, 1991, *Latviešu valodas praktiskā gramatika*, Rīga: Zvaigzne.
- CSÚCS Sándor, 2001, "Die Konjugation im Urpermischen", in *Congressus Nonus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum 7.-13.8.2000, Pars IV Dissertationes sectionum: Linguistica I*, Tartu, 190-198.
- 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.
- ERELT Mati (ed.), 2003, *Estonian Language*, Linguistica Uralica Supplementary Series, 1, Tallinn.
- GIVÓN Talmy, 2001, *Syntax II*, revised edition, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- GRONEMEYER Claire, 1997, "Evidentiality in Lithuanian", *Lund University, Department of Linguistics, Working Papers*, 46, 93-112.
- GRÜNTAL Willem, 1941, *Itämeren suomalaisten kielten yksikön nominatiivi objektin edustajana aktiivin yhteydessä*, Helsinki.
- HAKULINEN Lauri, 2000, *Suomen kielen rakenne ja kehitys*, 5. muuttamaton painos, Helsinki: Helsingin yliopiston Suomen kielen laitos.
- HAKULINEN Auli, LEINO Pentti, 1987, "Finnish participial construction from a discourse point of view", *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher*, 59, 35-43.
- HOLVOET Axel, 2004, "Evidencialumo kategorija", in HOLVOET Axel, SEMĖNIENĖ Loreta (eds.), *Gramatinių kategorijų tyrimai*, Vilnius: Lietuvių Kalbos Institutas.
- HOLVOET Axel, (to appear), *Mood and Modality in Baltic*, Cracow: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- IKOLA Osmo, 1953, "Viron ja liivin modus obliquuksen historiaa", *Suomi*, 106 (4), Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- JOHANSON Lars, UTAS Bo (eds.), 2000, *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*, Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 24, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- JOHANSON Lars, 2000, "Turkic indirectives", in JOHANSON Lars, UTAS Bo (eds.), *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 61-87.
- JOSEPH Brian, 2004, "Rescuing traditional (historical) linguistics from grammaticalization theory", in FISCHER Olga, NORDE Muriel, PERRIDON Harry (eds.), *Up and Down the Cline: the nature of grammatical-*

- zation, *Typological Studies in Language*, 59, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 45-71.
- KASK Arnold, 1984, *Eesti murded ja kirjakeel*, Tallinn: Valgus.
- KETTUNEN Lauri, 1924, *Lauseliikmed eesti keeles*, Tartu: Eesti Kirjanduse Selts.
- KETTUNEN Lauri, 1943, *Vepsän murteiden lauseopillinen tutkimus*, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 86, Helsinki.
- KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM Maria, WÄLCHLI Bernhard, 2001, "The Circum-Baltic languages: an areal-typological approach", in DAHL Östen, KOPTJEVSKAJA-TAMM Maria (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic Languages: Typology and Contact, vol. 2: Grammar and Typology*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 615-750.
- KORHONEN Mikko, 1973, "Zur Geschichte des negativen Präteritums und Perfekts im Ostseefinnischen und Lappischen", in *Commentationes Fenno-Ugricae in honorem Erkki Itkonen*, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 150, Helsinki, 174-184.
- KORHONEN Mikko, 1981, *Johdatus lapin kielen historiaan*, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia, 370, Helsinki.
- KUIRI Kaija, 1984, *Referointi Kainuun ja Pohjois-Karjalan murteissa*, Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia, 370, Helsinki.
- KÜNNAP Ago, 1992, "On the analytical past tense forms in the Uralic languages", *Linguistica Uralica*, XXVII, 173-179.
- KÜNNAP Ago, 1994, "On the Uralic indirectal", *Ural-Altische Jahrbücher*, 13, 18-27.
- KRUEGER John R., 1961, *Chuvash Manual: introduction, grammar, reader and vocabulary*, Indiana University Publications, Uralic and Altaic Series, 7, Bloomington/The Hague.
- LAANEST Arvo, 1982, *Einführung in die ostseefinnischen Sprachen*, Hamburg: Buske.
- LAGERCRANTZ Eliel, 1957, *Lappische Volksdichtung I: West- und südlappische Dialekte*, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 112, Helsinki.
- LAZARD Gilbert, 1999, "Mirativity, evidentiality, mediativity, or other?", *Linguistic Typology*, 3, 91-109.
- LEETBERG Karl, 1925, *Eesti keele grammatika: lauseõpetus*, Rakvere.
- LEINONEN Maria, VILKUNA Maria, 2000, "Past tenses in Permic languages", in DAHL Östen (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*, Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 20, Eurotyp, 6, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 495-514.
- LEINONEN Maria, 2000, "Evidentiality in Komi Zyryan", in JOHANSON Lars, UTAS Bo (eds.), *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 419-440.

- LEINONEN Maria, 2002, "Influence of Russian on the syntax of Komi", *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen*, 57, 195-358.
- LEVITSKAJA 1976 = ЛЕВИТСКАЯ Л. С., 1976, *Историческая морфология чувашского языка*, Москва: Наука.
- LEWY Ernst, 1922, *Tscheremissische Grammatik: Darstellung einer wiesent-scheremissischen Mundart*, Leipzig: Haessel.
- LINDSTEDT Jouko 2000, "The perfect: aspectual, temporal and evidential", in DAHL Östen (ed.), *Tense and Aspect in the Languages in Europe*, Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 20, Eurotyp, 6, Berlin/New York, 365-383.
- LYTKIN 1952 = ЛЫТКИН В.И., 1952, *Древнепермский язык*, Москва: Наука.
- METSLANG Helle, 1994, *Temporal Relations in the Predicate and the Grammatical System of Estonian and Finnish*, Oulun yliopiston suomen ja saamen kielen laitoksen tutkimusraportteja, 39, Oulu.
- METSLANG Helle, PAJUSALU Karl, 2002, "Evidentiality in South Estonian", *Linguistica Uralica*, XXXVIII, 98-109.
- METSLANG Helle, MUIŽNIECE Liena, PAJUSALU Karl, 1999, "Past participle finitization in Estonian and Latvian", in *Estonian: typological studies III*, Tartu Ülikooli Eesti Keele Õppetooli Toimetised, 11, 128-157.
- NICKEL Klaus Peter, 1990, *Samisk grammatikk*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- PAJUSALU Karl, MUIŽNIECE Liena, 1997, "Mineviku partitsiibi grammatikaliseerumisest lõunaestli murretes", in PAJUSALU Karl, JÜVÄ Sullöv (eds.), *Läänemeresoome lõunapiir – Ödagumeresoomõ lõunapiir*, Võro Instituudi Toimõndusõq, 1, Võru, 96-101.
- PALMAITIS Mykolas L., 1989, "Borussica: 2. astits, billäts – das preussische Modus Relativus", *Baltistica*, 25 (2), 128-132.
- RAUN Alo, 1988, "Proto-Uralic comparative historical morphosyntax", in SINOR Denis (ed), *The Uralic Languages: description, history and foreign influences*, Handbuch der Orientalistik, 8, Handbook of Uralic studies, 1, Leiden/New York: E. J. Brill, 555-571.
- ROTH Juliana, 1979, *Die indirekten Erlebnisformen im Bulgarischen. Eine Untersuchung zu ihrem Gebrauch in der Umgangssprache*, Slavistische Beiträge, 130, München: Sagner.
- SAARESTI Andrus, 1932, *Die estnische Sprache*, Tartu: Akadeemiline Kooperatiiv.
- SCHMALSTIEG William, 1992, "A few comments on the Old Prussian preterit tense", in SMOCZYNSKI Wojciech, HOLVOET Axel (eds.), *Colloquium Pruthenicum Primum: Papers from the First International Conference on Old Prussian Held in Warsaw, Sept 30th – Oct 1st, 1991*. Warsaw: University of Warsaw Press, 39-45.

- SEREBRENNIKOV 1960 = СЕРЕБРЕННИКОВ Борис А., 1960, *Категории времени и вида в финно-угорских языках пермской и волжской групп*, Москва: Наука.
- SEREBRENNIKOV 1963 = СЕРЕБРЕННИКОВ Борис А., 1963, *Историческая морфология пермских языков*, Москва: Наука.
- SORVAČOVA & BEZNOSIKOVA 1990 = СОРВАЧЕВА В. А., БЕЗНОСИКОВА Л. М., 1990, *Удорский диалект коми языка*, Москва: Наука.
- SIEGL Florian, 2004, *The 2nd Past in the Permic Languages: form, function, and a comparative analysis from a typological perspective*, Unpublished MA thesis, University of Tartu, Chair of Finnic languages (accessible via <http://www.utlib.ee/ekollekt/diss/mag/2004/b16700053/Siegl.pdf>)
- STIPA Günther, 1960, *Funktionen der Nominalformen des Verbs in den permischen Sprachen*, Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, 121, Helsinki.
- WÄLCHLI Bernhard, 2000, "Infinite predication as a marker of evidentiality and modality in the languages of the Baltic region", *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung*, 53, 186-210.
- WHITNEY William Dwight, 1964, *Sanskrit Grammar including both the Classical Language and the Older Dialects, of Veda and Brahmana*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- WIEDEMANN Ferdinand Johann, 1875, *Grammatik der Ehnischen Sprache, zunächst wie sie in Mittelehstland gesprochen wird, mit Berücksichtigung der anderen Dialekte*, St. Pétersbourg.
- WIEDEMANN Ferdinand Johann, 1884, *Grammatik der syrjänischen Sprache mit Berücksichtigung ihrer Dialekte und des Wotjakischen*, Sankt Petersburg.
- WINKLER Eberhard, 1997, *Krewinisch. Zur Erschließung einer ausgestorbenen ostseefinnischen Sprachform*, Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica, 49, Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz.
- WINKLER Eberhard, 2001, *Udmurt*, Languages of the World, Materials, 212, Munich: Lincom.

RÉSUMÉS

L'emploi évidentiel du participe passé en estonien

Le présent article étudie le développement du participe passé estonien, employé sans auxiliaire, en un prédicat évidentiel. Il répond à une récente

tentative de reconstruction (Metslang, Muižniece & Pajusalu 1999) qui supposait une évolution linéaire depuis l'emploi ancien du participe passé en tant que prédicat jusqu'à l'emploi actuel en tant qu'évidentiel et autres emplois périphériques. Les auteurs estiment que cette reconstruction est incorrecte, aussi bien du point de vue méthodologique que dans l'interprétation des matériaux tirés des autres langues. L'emploi évidentiel du participe passé ne dérive pas selon eux d'une fonction de son antécédent étymologique dans la proto-langue, mais de la réanalyse d'une construction grammaticale incluant le participe. L'actuel emploi évidentiel du participe reflète donc le sens de cette construction, et non un emploi ancien. Cette conclusion est fondée sur une analyse approfondie de matériaux comparables fournis par les langues finno-ougriennes orientales et les langues baltes.

Veelkord eesti keele mineviku kesksõna evidentsiaalsest kasutusest

Artikkel keskendub abiverbita mineviku kesksõna arenemisele eesti keeles evidentsiaalseks predikaadiks. See on mõeldud vastusena hiljutisele rekonstruktsioonikatsele (Metslang, Muižniece, Pajusalu 1999), mis kaitses lineaarset arengut kesksõna igivanast kasutusest õeldisena tänase evidentsiaalse ja mõningate teiste perifeersete kasutusteni. Artiklis väidetakse, et mainitud rekonstruktsioon on ekslik nii metodoloogiliselt seisukohalt kui ka teiste keelte materjali tõlgendamise osas. Peamiseks järelduseks on, et mineviku kesksõna evidentsiaalne kasutus ei ole tuletatav selle etimoloogilisest eelkäiaast algkeeles, vaid kesksõna sisaldavast konstruktsioonist. Kesksõna tänapäeva evidentsiaalne kasutus on teisisõnu konstruktsiooni enda ja mitte selle igivana kasutuse peegeldus. Selle järelduseni viib põhjalik idapoolsemate soome-ugri keelte ja balti keelte materjali analüüs.