

## ПОКАЗАТЕЛЬ КОСВЕННОЙ ЗАСВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВОВАННОСТИ В УДМУРТСКИХ ВОПРОСИТЕЛЬНЫХ КОНСТРУКЦИЯХ\*

*Ребека Кубич*

*Институт лингвистики Венгерской академии наук / Сегедский университет*

В статье исследуется маркер косвенной засвидетельствованности в вопросительных структурах в удмуртском (уральский, пермский) языке с типологической точки зрения. Рассматриваемые эвиденциальные показатели возможны в вопросительных конструкциях в удмуртском языке без формальных ограничений, и они отражают точку зрения говорящего. Их интерпретация соответствует их использованию в декларативных формах: они так же отмечают косвенную засвидетельствованность и адмиративность. Эвиденциальные формы склонны указывать на ментальное (и эмоциональное) состояние говорящего, и при этом вопросительные структуры с такими показателями можно интерпретировать как неканонические вопросы.

**Ключевые слова:** удмуртский язык, эвиденциальность, вопросительные структуры, косвенная засвидетельствованность, вопросы, адмиративность.

**Для цитирования:** Кубич Р. Показатель косвенной засвидетельствованности в удмуртских вопросительных конструкциях // Типология морфосинтаксических параметров. 2021. Том 4, вып. 2. С. 62–80. (На английском.)

---

\* Исследование выполнено при поддержке Национального ведомства по исследованиям, развитию и инновациям (NKFIH, Венгрия), проект «Эвиденциальность в уральских языках» (K139298, 2021–2024).

## THE INDIRECT EVIDENTIAL MARKER IN INTERROGATIVES IN UDMURT<sup>\*</sup>

*Rebeka Kubitsch*

*Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics HAS / University of Szeged*

The paper discusses the indirect evidential marker in interrogatives in Udmurt (Uralic, Permic) from a typological point of view. Indirect evidentials are possible in interrogative structures in Udmurt without formal restrictions and they mark the speaker's perspective. Their interpretation is in accordance with their use in declaratives: they mark indirect evidence and mirativity. Indirect evidentials tend to signal the speaker's mental (and emotional) state in such cases interrogative structures can be interpreted as non-canonical questions.

**Keywords:** Udmurt language, indirect evidentiality, interrogatives, questions, mirativity.

**For citation:** Kubitsch R. The indirect evidential marker in interrogatives in Udmurt. *Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters*. 2021. Vol. 4, iss. 2. Pp. 62–80.

---

<sup>\*</sup> The research was funded by the National Research, Development and Innovation Office, Hungary — NKFIH, “Evidentiality in the Uralic languages” (K139298, 2021–2024).

## 1. Introduction

Evidentiality is a category concerning the type of information source one has for a proposition [Aikhenvald 2004]. Although the notion of evidentiality and types of evidence are categorized differently in the available literature, cf. [Willett 1988, Aikhenvald 2004, Plungian 2010], generally, the types of direct and indirect evidence are distinguished. Since in Udmurt only indirect evidentiality is encoded morphologically, the study discusses indirect evidential forms in interrogatives.

The analysis relies on contemporary data of the online Udmurt corpora and on results of consultations with native speakers.<sup>1</sup> Interrogatives are typically associated with the speech act of questioning, cf. [Sadock, Zwicky 1985: 178–180; Higginbotham 1996]. The paper focuses on root interrogatives in questions. The study employs a typological point of view based on the works of Aikhenvald [2004; 2015] and San Roque et al. [2017].

The paper is organized the following way: section 2 gives an overview on the typological remarks on evidential marking in interrogatives and section 3 introduces evidentiality in declaratives in Udmurt. Section 4 discusses evidential marking in interrogatives and section 5 summarizes the results and relates them to the typological literature and to previous observations concerning Udmurt.

## 2. Typology of evidentials in questions

Typologically, the number of evidential markers possible in interrogative clauses is less than in declaratives [Aikhenvald 2004: 244; 2015: 256]. The typology outlined by San Roque et al. [2017] focuses on morphological marking of evidentiality in questions with interrogative morphosyntax. From the properties covered in their paper the issues of formal distribution and perspective are relevant for evidential marking in questions in Udmurt. Beside these features, the interpretation of such questions is also discussed in this section. Evidentials in interrogative structures in a given language are typically viewed in comparison to declaratives.

---

<sup>1</sup> Corpus data are from the main and one of the subcorpora of the online Udmurt Corpora. The main corpus has 9.57 million tokens and consists of texts of contemporary press, blogs, the Udmurt translation of the New Testament and some articles of Udmurt Wikipedia. The subcorpus has 2.66 million tokens and comprises open posts and comments of social media. (<http://udmurt.web-corpora.net/index.html>, last accessed: 24/11/2021).

Formally unrestricted evidential marking in interrogatives means that the same set of evidential markers can be found in interrogative structures as in declaratives. This can be observed for example in Nganasan (Uralic, Samoyedic) which has a four-term evidential system. Evidential marking can be partially restricted, therefore only a subset of evidential markers may appear in questions or only some interrogative structures may include them. Partial restriction can be found in Jarawara (Arawan) which allows evidential marking in polar but not in constituent interrogatives. There are languages where interrogative clauses cannot be marked for evidentiality — that is the case in Enets (Uralic, Samoyedic). Finally, a distinct evidential marking can be employed in interrogatives with markers different from the ones found in declaratives (cf. Tariana, Arawak).

Evidentiality is often viewed as a deictic category as it “marks a relation between the speaker and the action they describe” [de Haan 2005: 379]. Evidentials are generally considered speaker deictic [Brugman and Macaulay 2015: 216], consequently the speaker-anchored perspective is the default in declaratives. There are some languages which maintain this speaker-anchored perspective in questions as well, such as in the Yukaghir languages [Maslova 2003: 228]. However, it is cross-linguistically a more common pattern that the perspective in interrogative structures changes to be addressee-anchored, i.e. the evidential marker in questions signals the addressee’s information source anticipated by the speaker. This is also called interrogative flip [Tenny and Speas 2013] and can be observed, for example, in Turkish [Meriçli 2016: 10]. In addition, in some cases either speaker or addressee perspective seems to be a plausible interpretation, for example in Macedonian [Friedman 2003: 201].

The evidential marking in questions may have semantic and pragmatic connotations different from the ones found in statements [Aikhenvald 2004: 242]. Evidentials can have mirative or epistemic overtone in questions and as a pragmatic consequence, they are not interpreted as information seeking questions, but rather non-canonical ones, such as self-directed, relayed, or conjectural [San Roque et al. 2017]. Furthermore, appropriateness should be mentioned as well, which is also in connection with the perspective represented by evidentials in interrogatives and primarily concerns the issue of how polite it is to make assumptions about the addressee’s knowledge.

### 3. Evidentiality in declaratives in Udmurt

In Udmurt evidentiality can be expressed through morphological means only in the past tenses. The system comprises an indirect evidential and a default past tense. In the system the marking of indirect evidentiality is fused with the marking of the past tense, therefore in descriptive grammars it is often referred to as 2<sup>nd</sup> past tense. It primarily shows the speaker's lack of direct evidence about the events in question [Leinonen, Vilkkuna 2000; Skribnik, Kehayov 2018]. The marker does not differentiate between evidence types but values of hearsay or inferential evidence are determined contextually. The indirect evidential is also used to express mirativity, lack of control (only in first person context) and, implicitly, a lower degree of certainty<sup>2</sup> [Siegl 2004; Kubitsch 2022]. However, the exact interpretation the paradigm conveys is usually context-bound. Consider example (1) which can have the following interpretations in zero context: a) the speaker has indirect evidence (cf. evidentiality), b) speaker has just realized the current state of affairs and therefore might be surprised (cf. mirativity), c) the speaker is not committed to the truth of the proposition and does not know well the circumstances of the event in question (cf. epistemic modality, commitment). Note that these interpretations represent different notions related to knowledge [Aikhenvald 2021].

- (1) *tunne gurt-yn tyl-ez kysi-l'lam*  
 today village-INE electricity-ACC switch.off-EV.PST[3PL]  
 'Today electricity has been switched off in the village.' (I heard or I infer)  
 'Today electricity has been switched off in the village.' (I have not expected)  
 'Today electricity has been switched off in the village.' (I am not entirely sure)

However, the use of the indirect evidential is not obligatory even if the speaker has indirect evidence — the default past tense, often referred to as 1<sup>st</sup> past, is widely applicable to describing events happened in the past [Siegl 2004; Leinonen, Vilkkuna 2000].<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> The indirect evidential can (but not necessarily) implicate lower degree of certainty due to the pragmatic relationship between evidential source, evidential strength, and epistemic modality [Givón 2001].

<sup>3</sup> There is no unanimity in the literature of the Udmurt language about the status of the 1<sup>st</sup> past tense — in some works [GSUJ 1962, Tepljashina, Lytkin 1976, Tarakanov 2011] it is viewed as a direct evidential while other works consider it a default past tense [Leinonen, Vilkkuna 2000, Siegl 2004]. Based on the research of the author, encoding direct evidentiality is clearly not part of the semantics of the paradigm, but it is important to mention that contextually, especially in contrast to indirect evidential forms, it indeed can be associated with direct evidence, factuality, and higher degree of certainty.

Evidential distinction is possible in the analytic past tenses as well. Such tenses comprise a finite verb form and either the default past tense form or the indirect evidential form of the verb ‘be’ that are *val* and *vylem*, respectively.

#### 4. The indirect evidential in questions in Udmurt

Considering the Permic languages (Udmurt, Komi-Zyrian and Permyak) brief remarks have been made previously by Skribnik and Kehayov [2018: 542] on the occurrence and interpretation of evidentials in questions. These observations are based on the works of Leinonen and Vilkuna [2000: 498] and Siegl [2004: 161]. According to these, evidentials are observed in polar questions<sup>4</sup> but not in constituent questions. The evidential refers to the perspective of the questioner and conveys assumption or surprise. Also, evidentials are considered extremely rare in sentences marked orthographically as questions [Siegl 2004]. The following points discuss the typological properties outlined in the previous section, and review and specify these claims focusing on Udmurt.

##### 4.1. Formal distribution

Considering formal distribution three structures are discussed: constituent, polar and alternative questions [cf. Krifka 2011: 1744]. The current subsection focuses on structural properties and does not discuss interpretation. Notes on interrogative structures and question formation in Udmurt are based on Winkler [2011: 145–147], Miestamo [2011: 18] and Bartens [2000: 345].

The indirect evidential may appear in all question types introduced above. Constituent questions (cf. example (2)) are formed with interrogative pronouns. The position of the pronoun is not restricted in the sentence, but it usually appears in initial position. (2) is an extract from an interview conducted with an expert of traditional handicraft.

- (2) *Ogja kyžy vuri-ško vyl-em vaškala dyr-ja?*  
 all.together how sew-PRS.3PL be-EV.PST[3SG] old time-ADV  
 ‘Overall, how did they use to sew in the old times?’

---

<sup>4</sup> Both Leinonen and Vilkuna [2000: 498] and Siegl [2004: 161] cite one example for Komi-Zyrian and Udmurt, respectively. However, the Komi-Zyrian question does not have polar interrogative morphosyntax and it might be considered a rising declarative. In the Udmurt example the indirect evidential form appears in a statement which is followed by a question tag. Therefore, the indirect evidential form does not appear in an interrogative syntactic environment.

Polar interrogatives (cf. examples (3) and (4)) are formed with the clitic *=a* that is attached to the focus of the question. However, the clitic is ungrammatical with some other particles, such as the emphatic *uk* or *ved'* [Zubova et al. 2020]. Alternatively, polar questions can be marked only by intonation as well with a rising intonation on the constituent the focus of the question [GSUJ 1970: 26].

(3) is part of an interview with a famous Udmurt writer. The polar question clitic is attached to the verb in its indirect evidential form, but the joint appearance of *=a* and the indirect evidential is also possible in questions where it is attached to some other constituent of the sentence.<sup>5</sup> In (4) the question presupposes that human sacrificial rituals happened among Udmurts in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and asks about their frequency. The clitic is attached to the adverb *čem* 'often'.

- (3) *Šajan vyl-em=a so piči dyr-ja-z?*  
 mischievous be-EV[3SG]=Q s/he small time-INE-POSS.3SG  
 'Was she mischievous when she was a little child?'

- (4) *Čem=a pumišky-lo vyl-em ažlo vakyt-e udmurt-jos pölyn*  
 often=Q meet-FUT.3PL be-EV.PST[3SG] earlier period-ILL Udmurt-PL PP  
*ad'ami-os-ty vöšan-jos?*  
 human-PL-ACC sacrificial.ritual-PL  
 'Were human sacrificial rituals frequently encountered among Udmurts in earlier times?'

Alternative questions are formed either with the disjunction *jake* 'or' or with the double use of the polar interrogative clitic on the focused constituents. Sometimes a combination of both strategies can be observed, just as in (5), in which the question is evoked by a piece of news about a musician who sells his accordion. Each disjunct is marked with the clitic *=a* and the disjunction *jake* 'or'.

- (5) *Artist-len ukšo-jez=a byr-em jake*  
 artist-GEN money-POSS.3SG=Q run.out-EV.PST[3SG] or  
*krežgur tirlyk-jos-yz-a ukyr tros l'ukaški-l'lam?*  
 music instrument-PL-POSS.3SG=Q too much collect-EV.PST[3PL]  
 'Did either the artist run out of money, or did he accumulate too many musical instruments?'

<sup>5</sup> Such questions can be considered focus questions. Focus questions contain a focused constituent and have background assumptions which are not part of the question [Kiefer 1980: 100–101]. In example (4) the background assumption is that there were indeed human sacrificial rituals, and the question focuses on their frequency.

Although the paper focuses on root interrogatives, it has to be mentioned that indirect evidentials appear in embedded interrogatives as well, since evidential marking is possible in subordinate clauses in Udmurt.<sup>6</sup> Example (6) is a comment on a story about how some children were attacked by dogs and saved themselves by climbing to the top of a tree.

- (6) *Kyžy syče piči špana-os kyz jyl-e tuby-ny bygati-l'am,*  
 how such small child-PL pine peak-ILL climb-INF be.able-EV.PST[3PL]

*mon ponna vala-n-tem.*

I PP understand-NMLZ-CAR

‘How such small children could climb to the top of the pine tree, I cannot understand.’

As the examples show, Udmurt can be reckoned among languages with formally unrestricted evidential marking in interrogatives, even though differences can be observed in the frequency of structures — that is discussed in section 4.4.

## 4.2. Perspective

In accordance with previous claims, the current investigation confirms that the indirect evidential maintains the speaker’s perspective in interrogatives.

In the context of example (7) the author of this segment is having a phone conversation with their mother. The mother suddenly hangs up and calls again thirty minutes later and explains herself (i.e. her husband brought guests). The questioner asks the question in (7). In this case the questioner has only indirect evidence as they are in a different town at the time, and talking on the phone. The addressee of the question, however, being present, has direct evidence.

- (7) *Kin-jos-yz so pyr-t-em?*  
 who-PL-ACC s/he enter-CAUS-EV.PST[3SG]  
 ‘Who did he welcome?’

<sup>6</sup> Evidential marking in subordinate clauses is typologically rare [Forker 2018]. In Udmurt indirect evidential forms in subordinate clauses are used to indicate indirect evidence and mirativity. They are more frequently observed in complement clauses with verbs expressing cognitive processes or speech in the main clause (*verba dicendi et sentiendi*).



Example (8) also shows speaker-anchored perspective. It is part of short report on a *krezh*<sup>7</sup> playing contest. One of the contestants participated with their mother and brothers. The mother tells the reporter that all their children are quite musical, they play different musical instruments and also sing. After that, the reporter asks the mother the question seen in (8). The questioner does not have direct evidence about the background of the addressee's children, while, naturally, the addressee has.

- (8) *Kin vyžy-je myni-l'am nylpi-os-ty?*  
 who root-ILL go-EV.PST[3PL] child-PL-POSS.2PL  
 'Whose tracks your children followed?'

The evidential contribution targets the presupposition of the question [cf. Maslova 2003 on Yukaghir]. In (7) the presupposition is that the father welcomed someone, and the evidential contribution is that the questioner has indirect evidence about this. In (8) the questioner presupposes that the children are musical because they followed the steps of one of their relatives and the indirect evidential shows that questioner's lack of direct evidence. The same can be observed in the examples in section 4.1. For instance, in example (2) the presupposition is that there is a way they used to sew in the old times. The evidential contribution is that the questioner has indirect evidence about the presupposition. In languages with addressee-anchored perspective in interrogatives the evidential contributes to the answer (i.e. the questioner assumes a specific type of evidence the answer will be based on).

Based on the evaluation of native speakers it seems that the addressee-anchored interpretation of the indirect evidential is not possible in questions. Speakers were presented with the following situation: we are playing a game when I hide a marble in one of my hands and they have to guess in which hand it is. In the description it was specified that they did not see me hiding the marble and they do not know in which hand it is currently located. After that, speakers had to judge which of the following questions would be acceptable in this situation:

- (9) a. *Jadro-jez kud-az ki-jam vati-skem?*  
 marble-DET which-DET.ILL hand-ILL.POSS.1SG hide-EV.PST[1SG]  
 'Which hand did I hide the marble in?'

<sup>7</sup> Traditional Udmurt musical instrument.

b. *Jadrojez kudaz kijam vat-i?*  
 marble-DET which-DET.ILL hand-ILL.POSS.1SG hide-PST[1SG]  
 ‘Which hand did I hide the marble in?’

In declaratives first person indirect evidential forms encode the speaker’s lack of control or lack of awareness in connection with their own actions which are typically realized post factum due to some sort of evidence [Kubitsch 2019]. If addressee-anchored perspective was possible, and the indirect evidential flipped in interrogatives to say something about the information status of the addressee, it could be used in questions to show the addressee’s lack of direct evidence and awareness about the whereabouts of the marble. However, consultations showed that in such cases the first person evidential form conveys the same meaning as in declaratives — it expresses the speaker’s lack of control, in this specific case, for example, the speaker has forgotten where they hid the marble. Because of this the use of the indirect evidential is infelicitous in the context outlined above.<sup>8</sup>

According to the typological literature the speaker-anchored perspective in interrogatives is typical for languages with indirect or inferential evidentials [San Roque et al. 2017: 134]. The more direct the evidence the marker is encoding,<sup>9</sup> the more likely it represents addressee perspective in questions. In Udmurt, the different types of indirect evidence are not basic categories, the indirect evidential marking is not differentiated from this point of view.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> However, the judgment of native speakers was not completely homogenous — for some of them the indirect evidential form was acceptable to some extent in the above mentioned situation, but they immediately noted that the default past tense is preferred. Even though it may be acceptable, based on their evaluation, the form still encodes the speaker’s lack of control. It is possible that in the context above the indirect evidential could be used as a stylistic strategy when the speaker behaves as if they did not know where the marble is or in remind-me questions. However, this assumption needs further investigation.

<sup>9</sup> The outlined hierarchy: participation > vision > other sensory experience > inference/report [San Roque et al. 2017: 133].

<sup>10</sup> From a historic point of view, Udmurt indirect evidentiality is also in connection with inferentiality. The paradigm of the indirect evidential past tense is based on the perfect participle and in many works the paradigm is historically associated with a perfect past tense [Bartens 2000: 202–203; Izvorski 1997: 236]. In addition, a typological connection is established between inference and perfect meanings [Comrie 1976: 110; Aikhenvald 2015: 268] as both category focuses on the result of an event and perfects can develop into evidentials in many languages [Bybee et al. 1994: 97].

### 4.3. Interpretation

As some examples have already suggested, the indirect evidential in questions has the same types of interpretation as in statements. It can signal the questioner's indirect evidence (cf. (2), (7), (8)), mirativity<sup>11</sup> and lack of control. The latter is possible only in first person contexts (cf. (9a)). These notions are strongly connected, and they do not exclude each other. Speaking of declaratives, a piece of information can be acquired through indirect means and be unexpected at the same time. The same holds for questions — despite the speaker's lack of direct evidence about the events the indirect evidential also can imply mirativity.<sup>12</sup>

The latter can result in the pragmatic consequence that such questions rather reflect the speaker's mental and emotional state than seeking for information. The speaker's realization of the occurrence of a (possible unexpected) event triggers them posing (rather than asking) a question [cf. Lyons 1977]. Utterances with the indirect evidential are often considered to be more emotive, not only in questions, but in declaratives as well. Also, an emotional value is frequently associated with mirative markers in the typological literature [Aikhenvald 2012]. Utilizing the emotiveness of the indirect evidential to show the speaker's attitude towards the propositional content results in non-canonical questions, such as questions posed to express wonder (cf. (10)) or reflective ones (cf. (11)). Reflective questions do not oblige the addressee to answer but express the speaker's interest in an issue [Krifka 2011: 1743]. In Udmurt these questions are also often accompanied with the speaker's surprise or with other emotional values. This also shows that indirect evidential forms maintain the speaker's viewpoint in questions as they reflect on the speaker's emotional and mental status. In written texts such questions are often marked orthographically differently (e.g. excessive use of punctuation).

---

<sup>11</sup> Mirativity is typically associated with new information and speaker's surprise [DeLancey 1997]. Here I adopt the definition of Mexas [2016] about mirativity. According to his analysis, the core meaning of mirativity is realization, namely the transition from the state of lacking awareness to the state of awareness. This realization can result in speaker's surprise, but surprise is not a criterion for the mirative reading. Other kindred notions are unexpectedness and counter-expectation (cf. [Slobin, Aksu 1982]), which can be the cause of mirative marking. According to Mexas [2016: 10] unexpectedness is an overtone of realization, which can be "the logical antecedent of the latter (i.e. realization), although not necessarily a condition for its occurrence".

<sup>12</sup> Note, that the mirative interpretation in declaratives is not always implied. Instances can be found of the evidential past tense form of the verb 'be' *vylem* which encodes mirativity without referring to the information source of the speaker. Such type of use was not observed in questions so far.

Emotive value can be seen in (10). For the jubilee of a regional newspaper local students prepared presents made from former issues of the paper (e.g. a dress, a dog, a doll, flowers and a cake). Members of the editorial board were amazed by the creativity of the students and the number of gifts they had prepared. After describing the gifts in detail, the author of the segment poses the questions below. On the one hand the speaker has indirect evidence as they were not present during the preparation of the gifts. On the other hand, the use of the indirect evidential highlights their astonishment.

- (10) *Ku vañ-ze ta-je soos vui-l'am lešty-ny?!*  
 when all-DET.ACC this-ACC they arrive-EV.PST[3PL] make-INF

*Kyžy bygati-l'am tače usto pörmyty-ny?!*  
 how be.able-EV.PST[3PL] such excellent make-INF

‘When did they have the time to do all of this?! How could they make it so wonderfully?!’

In example (11) the speaker expresses their incomprehension (and disapproval) that a Russian woman is sent to a Finno-Ugric beauty pageant as an Udmurt delegate. The indirect evidential shows the speaker’s evidence type and increases the emotive value of the question complementing the expression of the speaker’s attitude. In order to have a better understanding of the context not only the question formed with the indirect evidential is presented, but the questions preceding and following it.

- (11) *Maly finn-ugor čošatskon-e žuč nyl myn-e?*  
 why Finno-Ugric competition-ILL Russian girl go-PRS.3SG

*Ma, čeber UDMURT nyl-jos byri-l'am = a???*  
 what, beautiful Udmurt girl-PL run.out-EV.PST[3PL] = Q

*Jake so udmurt = a? Kin ke tod-e = a??*  
 or s/he Udmurt = Q who if know-PRS.3SG = Q

‘Why does a Russian girl participate in the Finno-Ugric competition? What, have we run out of beautiful UDMURT girls??? Or is she Udmurt? Does anyone know??’

The inference about the possible unavailability of an Udmurt woman suitable for a beauty pageant is drawn by the fact that a Russian one is participating. The question does not actually seek for information, but it is a speculation

about the evaluation of evidence. The indirect evidential form indicates that the inference (there are not available Udmurt women for the competition) does not correlate with the speaker's beliefs (there should be available Udmurt women who can be sent to a Finno-Ugric themed competition). The contradiction is underlined by the questions following the highlighted segment — the conclusion does not correspond to the speaker's expectations therefore they try to resolve the contradiction by asking whether the participant might be Udmurt after all.

Furthermore, based on consultations with native speakers,<sup>13</sup> a distinction can be made between questions formed with the indirect evidential and with the non-evidential past tense in terms of expressing the speaker's attitude and seeking for information. Such difference was established by the third of the informants.

- (12) a. *Kyžy aźlo tyl-tek uli-l'am?*  
 how long.ago electricity-car live-EV.PST[3PL]  
 'How did they live without electricity back then?'  
 b. *Kyžy aźlo tyl-tek ul-i-zy?*  
 how long.ago e lectricity-car live-PST-3PL  
 'How did they live without electricity back then?'

According to this distinction, the question formed with the indirect evidential (12a) highlights the speaker's attitude towards the propositional content. As a result, such questions are formed to express the speaker's surprise or wondering about a given situation but do not necessarily request an answer. During the consultations they were often paraphrased inserting the particle *meda* 'I wonder' (example (13)) which are used in reflective questions [Zubova 2018].

- (13) *Kyžy meda aźlo tyl-tek uli-l'am?*  
 how PTC long.ago electricity-car live-EV.PST[3PL]  
 '[I wonder] how they lived without electricity.'

---

<sup>13</sup> Consultations were originally conducted to examine evidentiality in Udmurt and were carried out with 26 native informants. During the task speakers had to provide a possible speech situation in which, in their estimation, the given sentence can be uttered. Informants first were presented with the sentence including evidential past tense forms. After that a modified version of the sentence with the default past tense form were given and speakers had to characterize the differences between the two versions of the sentence.

However, the question formed with the non-evidential past tense (12.b) seeks for information and is not associated with an emotional value. Differences can be observed between the prosody as well: information seeking constituent questions have a falling, while questions displaying the speaker's emotional state have a rising intonation.<sup>14</sup>

Of course, the content of the question seen in example (12) is prone to have the interpretation of speaker's surprise. But the fact that some speakers distinguished indirect evidential and past tense forms according to the above mentioned viewpoints, confirms that the indirect evidential can contribute to the non-canonical interpretation of a question.

It is important that the use of the indirect evidential does not automatically result in a non-canonical question. Indirect evidentials can occur in proper information seeking questions without any overtone of wondering or surprise (cf. examples (2), (3), (7), (8)). Therefore, their application in questions is not a systematic strategy to form non-canonical questions. But such forms are still tools for highlighting the speaker's emotional and mental state towards the propositional content.

#### 4.4. Remarks on frequency

There is no precise data available about the frequency of evidential marking in interrogatives although some observations can be made in this regard. For practical reasons, claims about frequency are based on a sample of texts collected from blogs.<sup>15</sup> The collection contains 300 blog entries, approximately 86000 tokens, 1151 indirect evidential forms. The table below summarizes the distribution of questions containing an indirect evidential verb form.

Table 1. Distribution of questions containing an indirect evidential verb form

| Constituent questions |          | Alternative questions |          | Polar questions            |          |                              |          |
|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|----------------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|
| n/a                   |          | n/a                   |          | Morphosyntactically marked |          | Morphosyntactically unmarked |          |
| Root                  | Embedded | Root                  | Embedded | Root                       | Embedded | Root                         | Embedded |
| 13                    | 4        | 1                     | —        | —                          | —        | 1                            | 1        |
| 17                    |          | 1                     |          | 2                          |          |                              |          |

<sup>14</sup> In addition, according to Krasnova [2010: 118] “emotional” questions have steeper rises and falls in their pitch contour compared to information seeking ones. However, her analysis has been carried out on polar questions.

<sup>15</sup> The online Udmurt corpora is excellent to find examples but despite all advantages, it is not suitable for a statistical analysis of evidential marking in questions.

Based on the sample it can be seen, that from the 20 attested questions, 17 of them were constituent questions, and only 2 were polar ones. Although, none of them were formed with the *=a* clitic, i.e., structurally they were not interrogatives. Corpus data show that indirect evidential marking is nonetheless possible in polar interrogatives (cf. (3)). However, the dominance of constituent questions in the sample can tell us about the frequency of evidential marking in different types of questions/interrogative structures.

Based on this sample and my own observations evidential marking in interrogatives is not a commonly attested phenomenon. Also, evidentials in polar interrogatives seem to be less frequent than in constituent ones. San Roque et al. [2017] report on similar findings in their typological research on languages which maintain speaker-anchored perspective in interrogative structures. A possible reason outlined by their study is that in the case of constituent questions the reality of an event is presupposed by the speaker to some extent (ibid.), i.e. the speaker knows that the event has happened but is ignorant for some details (cf. (2), (7)). The Udmurt data seem to confirm this claim.

## 5. Conclusion

The paper reviewed the occurrence and use of the indirect evidential past tense in interrogatives in Udmurt from a typological point of view. It can be concluded that such forms can occur in different types of interrogative structures without formal restrictions. Evidentially marked interrogatives maintain the speaker's perspective. The interpretation of the indirect evidentials in such constructions is in accordance with their interpretation in their declarative counterparts. They encode the speaker's indirect evidence, and they can also express mirativity. Encoding the speaker's emotional and mental state via the evidentials results in the pragmatic consequence that these questions do not primarily seek for information. In connection with frequency, it can be postulated that evidential marking in interrogative structures and in questions generally is rare.

The findings partially confirm and specify further the previous observations about the topic. From a structural point of view, up to this point indirect evidentials were observed only in polar questions, however, none of the cited examples contain the polar interrogative clitic. Examples have shown that indirect evidentials are compatible with the polar interrogative clitic *=a*. They also appear in constituent and alternative question structures as well. Considering the perspective encoded by the evidential, the current findings confirm the

previous claim (e.g. speaker-anchored perspective). The interpretation of evidentially marked questions show that they do not only encode assumption, but rather indirect evidence in general. Also, they are attested in canonical (cf. example (2), (3), (7), (8)) and special questions (cf. examples (10), (11), (12a)). Observations about frequency can also be specified, namely, that indirect evidential forms occurred more often in constituent questions. Also, a possible pragmatic consequence is outlined of the use of indirect evidentials in interrogative structures.

Furthermore, the Udmurt data confirm two typological claims proposed by San Roque et al. [2017]. One is that the speaker-anchored perspective in interrogatives is typical for languages which have a non-differentiated indirect evidential marker (cf. section 4.2). The second one is that speaker-anchored evidentials are typologically more frequently observed in constituent questions (cf. section 4.4).

## Abbreviations

1, 2, 3 — 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> person; ACC — accusative; ADV — adverbialis; EV.PST — evidential past tense; CAR — caritive; CAUS — causative; CVB — converb; DET — determinative; FUT — future tense; GEN — genitive; INF — infinitive; INE — inessive; INS — instrumental; ILL — illative; NMLZ — nominalizer; PRS — present tense; PST — past tense; PL — plural; POSS — possessive; PP — postposition; PTC — particle; PTCP — participle; SG — singular; Q — question clitic.

## References

- Aikhenvald 2004 — Aikhenvald A.Yu. Evidentiality. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Aikhenvald 2012 — Aikhenvald A.Yu. The essence of mirativity. *Linguistic Typology*. 2012. Vol. 16. No. 1. Pp. 435–485.
- Aikhenvald 2015 — Aikhenvald A.Yu. Evidentials: their links with other grammatical categories. *Linguistic Typology*. 2015. Vol. 19. No. 2. Pp. 239–277.
- Aikhenvald 2021 — Aikhenvald A.Yu. The Web of Knowledge. Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2021.
- Bartens 2000 — Bartens R. Permilaisten kielten rakenne ja kehitys [The structure and development of the Permic languages]. *Suomalais-ugralaisen seuran toimituksia*. Vol. 238. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura, 2000.
- Brugman and Macaulay 2015 — Brugman C.M., Macaulay M. Characterizing evidentiality. *Linguistic Typology*. 2015. Vol. 19. No. 2. Pp. 201–237.
- Bybee et al. 1994 — Bybee J., Perkins R., Pagliuca W. The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Comrie 1996 — Comrie B. Aspect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- de Haan 2005 — de Haan F. Encoding speaker perspective: Evidentials. *Linguistic diversity and language theories*. Frajzyngier E., Hodges A., Rood D.S. (eds.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2005. Pp. 379–417.



- DeLancey 1997 — DeLancey S. Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology*. 1997. Vol. 1. No. 1 Pp. 33–52.
- Friedman 2003 — Friedman V.A. Evidentiality in the Balkans with special attention to Macedonian and Albanian. *Studies in Evidentiality*. Aikhenvald A.Yu., Dixon R.M.W. (eds.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. 189–218.
- Forker 2018 — Forker D. Evidentiality and Its Relations With Other Verbal Categories. *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Aikhenvald A.Yu. (ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. Pp. 65–84.
- Givón 2001 — Givón T. *Syntax. An Introduction*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001.
- GSUJ 1962 — *Grammatika sovremennogo udmurtskogo yazyka* [Grammar of the contemporary Udmurt language]. Vol. 1. Perevosikov P.N. (ed.). Izhevsk: Udmurtskoye Kinzhnoye Izdatel'stvo, 1962.
- GSUJ 1970 — *Grammatika sovremennogo udmurtskogo yazyka* [Grammar of the contemporary Udmurt language]. Vol. 2. Alatyryeva V.I. (ed.). Izhevsk: Udmurtskoye Kinzhnoye Izdatel'stvo, 1970.
- Higginbotham 1996 — Higginbotham J. The semantics of questions. *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*. Lappin S. (ed.). Oxford & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996. Pp. 361–383.
- Izvorski 1997 — Izvorski R. The present perfect as an epistemic modal. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*. 1997. Vol. 7. Pp. 222–239.
- Kiefer 1980 — Kiefer F. Yes-No Questions as Wh-Questions. *Speech act theory and pragmatics (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 10)* Searle J.R., Kiefer F., Bierwisch M. (eds.). Dordrecht: Reidel, 1980. Pp. 79–119.
- Krifka 2011 — Krifka M. Questions. *Semantics. An international handbook of natural language meaning*. Vol. II. von Stechow K., Maienborn C., Portner P. (eds.). Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter, 2011. Pp. 1742–1784.
- Krasnova 2010 — Krasnova T.A. Intonatsiya obshchego voprosa v udmurtskom yazyke [Intonation of general questions in the Udmurt language]. *Vestnik Udmurtskogo Universiteta. Seriya Istorija i filologija*. 2010. Vol. 2. Pp. 115–120.
- Kubitsch 2019 — Kubitsch R. Az evidencialitás és az első személy kapcsolata az udmurt nyelvben [The relationship of evidentiality and first person in the Udmurt language]. *Nyelvtudományi Közlemények*. 2019. Vol. 115. Pp. 85–108.
- Kubitsch 2022 — Kubitsch R. The Semantic Profile of the Past Evidential in Udmurt in Contemporary Texts. *Aspects of Tenses, Modality and Evidentiality*. Baranzini L., de Saussure L. (eds.). Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2022. Pp. 262–287.
- Leinonen, Vilkkumäki 2000 — Leinonen M., Vilkkumäki M. Past tenses in Permic languages. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Dahl Ö. (ed.). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. Pp. 497–514.
- Lyons 1977 — Lyons J. *Semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Maslova 2003 — Maslova E. Evidentiality in Yukaghir. *Studies in Evidentiality*. Aikhenvald A.Yu., Dixon R.M.W. (eds.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. 219–235.
- Meriçli 2016 — Meriçli B.S. Modeling Indirect Evidence. Ph.D. dis. University of California, Santa Cruz, 2016.
- Mexas 2016 — Mexas H. Mirativity as realization marking: A cross-linguistic study. MA. Thesis. Universiteit Leiden, 2016.

- Miestamo 2011 — Miestamo M. Polar interrogatives in Uralic languages. *Linguistica Uralica*. 2011. Vol. 47. Pp. 1–21.
- Plungian 2010 — Plungian V.A. Types of verbal evidentiality marking: An overview. *Linguistic Realization of Evidentiality in European Languages*. Diewald G., Smirnova E. (eds.). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2010. Pp. 15–58.
- Sadock, Zwicky 1985 — Sadock J., Zwicky A. *Speech Act Distinctions in Syntax. Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Vol. I: Clause Structure. Shopen T. (ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985. Pp. 155–196.
- San Roque et al. 2017 — San Roque L., Floyd S., Norcliffe E. Evidentiality and interrogativity. *Lingua*. 2017. Vol. 186–187. Pp. 120–143.
- Serebrennikov 1960 — Serebrennikov B.A. *Kategorii vremeni i vida v finno-ugorskiy yazykakh permskoy i volzhskoy grupp* [The category of tense and aspect in the Permic branch of the Finno-Ugric languages]. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk USSR, 1960.
- Siegl 2004 — Siegl F. The 2<sup>nd</sup> past in the Permic languages. M.A. Thesis. University of Tartu, 2004.
- Skribnik, Kehayov 2018 — Skribnik E., Kehayov P. Evidentials in Uralic Languages. *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Aikhenvald A.Yu. (ed.). New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. Pp. 525–555.
- Slobin, Aksu 1982 — Slobin D.I., Aksu A.A. Tense, aspect and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential. *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics & Pragmatics*. Hopper P.J. (ed.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1982. Pp. 185–200.
- Tarakanov 2011 — Tarakanov I.V. Karonkyl [Verb]. *Udmurt kyllen veraškonl'ukettodosez (morfologija)* [Morphology of the Udmurt language]. Timerkhanova N.N. (ed.). Izhevsk: Udmurt uni'ersit'et izdat'el'stvo, 2011. Pp. 138–254.
- Tenny and Speas 2003 — Tenny C., Speas P. Configurational properties of point of view roles. *Asymmetry in grammar*. Di Sciullo A.M. (ed.). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2003. Pp. 315–343.
- Tepljasina and Lytkin 1976 — Tepljasina T.I., Lytkin V.I. *Permskiye yazyki* [The Permic languages]. *Osnovy finno-ugorskogo yazykoznaniye* [Fundamentals of Finno-Ugric linguistics]. Lytkin V.I., Majtinskaya K.E., Rédei K. (eds.). Moscow: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk USSR, 1976. Pp. 97–228.
- Udmurt corpora, <http://udmurt.web-corpora.net/index.en.html> (last visited: 26/11/2021)
- Willett 1988 — Willett T. A cross-linguistic survey of grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language*. 1988. Vol. 12. Pp. 51–97.
- Winkler 2011 — Winkler E. *Udmurtische Grammatik* [Udmurt Grammar]. *Veröffentlichungen Der Societas Uralo-Altaica* Vol. 81. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2011.
- Zubova 2018 — Zubova I. Discourse particles in dialogue questions in Beserman Udmurt. Talk at the The 2<sup>nd</sup> HSE Semantics and Pragmatics Workshop [05.09.2018], 2018.
- Zubova et al. 2020 — Zubova I., Leego E-R., Teptiuk D. On adaptation of Russian discourse particles *ved'* and *že* in Eastern Finno-Ugric languages. Talk at the 54<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea [30.08.-01.09.2020], 2020.

Статья поступила в редакцию 01.12.2021

The article was received on 01.12.2021

**Ребека Кубич**

магистр; Институт лингвистики Венгерской академии наук; Сегедский университет

**Rebeka Kubitsch**

Master of Arts; Hungarian Research Centre for Linguistics HAS; University of Szeged

[kubitsch.rebeka@nytud.hu](mailto:kubitsch.rebeka@nytud.hu)