

Perspectives of Baltic Philology

Edited by

JOWITA NIEWULIS-GRABLUNAS

JUSTYNA PRUSINOWSKA

EWA STRYCYŃSKA-HODYL



POZNAŃ 2008

NON-FINITE PREDICATES AS A VOICING DEVICE IN STEFANIA ULANOWSKA'S LATGALIAN FAIRYTALES

Nicole Nau (Poznań)

This article explores the use of participles and the infinitive as predicates in represented speech. The language under investigation is a Latgalian dialect as documented in a collection of fairytales from the late 19th century. In these texts non-finite predicates are mainly used to mark the voice of a character as opposed to the voice of the narrator. A distinction between direct and indirect speech is of no importance here. It is argued that this technique of voicing is not an instance of evidentiality and that the use of participles in this dialect differs markedly from the oblique mood in Low Latvian and Lithuanian.

The creation of voices, more than the depiction of actions, occasions the imagination of alternative and distant worlds that is the stuff of dreams and art. (Tannen 1986: 311).

0 Introduction

The fairytales collected and published by the Polish ethnographer Stefania Ulanowska at the end of the 19th century (Ulanowska 1895) are a source deserving special interest not only in folklore studies, but at least as much in Baltic and general linguistics. Despite the fact that the collector most probably was not a native speaker but had learnt the dialect only during her fieldwork, the language of Ulanowska's collection has been judged as highly authentic by experts of Latgalian (Juško-Štekele 2001; Leikuma 2001; Soida 1950). It represents the High Latvian subdialect of Viļāni, an oral variety of Latgalian largely unaffected by standardization and contact with Low Latvian. We find here a considerable amount of constructions which differ in form and / or function from Low Latvian and Lithuanian and which therefore are of interest for typological as well as historical comparative studies. One such area of interest are non-finite predicates, especially the use of participles as predicates in place of a finite verb. In the present paper I will show the function of this construction as a "voicing device" (see section 1) and discuss its relation to the categories of evidentiality and mood as well as differences to the oblique mood in Low Latvian and Lithuanian (section 6). I am not concerned with the history of the construction, nor the question of the development of the oblique mood. However, the material presented here will probably be of interest to scholars

working on such questions. The main part of the paper (section 2 – 5) is devoted to a detailed description of the constructions in the texts.

All examples will be cited in the orthography used in the original publication, thus the "old orthography" of Latgalian before the reformation process which started at the beginning of the 20th century (cf. Stafecka 2004). For each example, the number of the fairytale in the collection is given as reference. Errors in the transcription and misprints have not been corrected.

1 Narrative voice and represented speech

Fairytales are a special type of narrative fiction, typically told by a third-person narrator. In addition to passages where we hear the voice of this narrator, most fairytales also contain dialogues between characters of the story. Such instances will be called here "**represented speech**". In represented speech, it is the voice of a character we hear, the narrator steps back and yields the floor to one of the heroes. There are various means how to mark such a switch of narrative voice⁴². When stories are told orally, prosodic means are probably most important, while in written texts quotation marks and other graphic devices indicate that a part of discourse belongs to the voice of a character. In both instances the voice of the narrator is unmarked. A widely used lexical means for marking represented speech is its explicit introduction by words like "said (that)". Represented speech may also be marked grammatically, and most often such a marking affects verbs. In the investigated Latgalian fairytales the voice of a character as opposed to that of the narrator very regularly is indicated by the use of non-finite predicates. Consider the following example, the beginning of the fairytale "Ap glupu bobu" (The silly wife):

(1)	Ap glupu bobu (17), free translation	comment
(a)	<p><i>Bieja tašs, i motia, i dals, - trejus win <u>dziejwoja</u> i <u>bieja jim nu-kašts wiepris</u>.</i></p> <p>There were a father, a mother, and a son – the three of them lived together, and they had a hog slaughtered.</p>	<p>background setting, narrator</p> <p><u>past tense</u></p>

⁴² To avoid confusion of the term *voice* as used here and the homonymous term *voice* 'diathesis, genus verbi', I will sometimes refer to the former by "narrative voice". For the concept of voice in narrative studies cf. Genette 1987; Abbott 2002: 64-66; 70-72.

(b)	<i>Tys taiš soka iz moti:</i> Father said to mother:	story, narrator <u>present tense</u>
(c)	<i>"Tieš, siwień, na woriet tagad daūdž gališ, a gļobot' garam pawasaram!"</i> "You, my dear wife, shall not cook a lot of meat now, but save it for the long spring!"	repr. speech <u>infinitive</u>
(d)	<i>Iz-braūc jis nu satys ar daļu, motia wina pa-lik i at-it saldats. Jej soka taj iz ju:</i> He went away with his son, mother stayed at home alone, and along came a soldier. She said to him:	narrator <u>present tense</u>
(e)	<i>"Dutu szej tieš ašt', a wot bada, ka postnys jedinis, –</i> "I would give you something to eat, but the problem is, there is only Lenten fare, –	repr. speech <u>conditional</u>
(f)	<i>wieprits ass nu-kaūts, bet wiejrs i dals lykuzi turiet' pawasaram garam!" –</i> a hog has been slaughtered, but husband and son told me to keep it for the long spring!"	repr. speech <u>participles</u>
(g)	<i>"Ak, mamień! szys pat's i ass gars pawasars! Nu Di'n, mamień, szys i ass pawasars!" –</i> "Oh, dear woman! I am myself the long spring! Dear me, I am the long spring!"	repr. speech <u>participles</u>
(h)	<i>Jej pa-jemia i at-diewa jam tu wiepri!</i> She went along and gave him the hog!	narrator <u>past tense</u>
(i)	<i>Atbraūc wiejrs i dals, a jej sōk runot':</i> Husband and son came home, and she said:	narrator <u>present tense</u>
(j)	<i>ku tagad szy jeszkuszi, ka pawasars at-gojis szudiņ, szej i at-dawusia jam wiepri! –</i> What will we eat now, the long spring came today, and I gave him the hog!	repr. speech <u>participles</u>
(k)	<i>Soka wiejrs:</i> The husband said:	narrator <u>present tense</u>
(l)	<i>"Woj tu ta troka, boba, biejusia? Woj tu riedziejusia, kab pawasars stajgotu?"</i> "Were you mad, woman? Have you ever seen that the spring would walk?"	repr. speech <u>participles;</u> <u>conditional</u> in subordinate clause

In this story finite and non-finite predicates are used very consequentially: the predicates of clauses which belong to the voice of the narrator are in the finite present or past tense, while in represented speech, the predicates are participles

or infinitives, thus non-finite forms⁴³. Given this distribution, the use of non-finite predicates is an indicator that we are hearing the voice of a character as opposed to the voice of the narrator. I will call such indicators "**voicing devices**". The distribution of finite and non-finite predicates is not always as neat as in the above example: finite predicates are also widely used in represented speech, and non-finite predicates are sometimes found in sentences which belong to the voice of the narrator.

The term "represented speech" is preferred here over the more common term "reported speech/discourse" to emphasize the fact that we are not dealing with a speaker's report of what someone else has said, but with the construction of dialogues as part of a story. This point has been made by Tannen (1986), and we will see later that it is important for the interpretation of the Latgalian forms and their relation to participles in Low Latvian and Lithuanian and to the category of evidentiality. I owe my inspiration to use the term "represented speech" to Vandelanotte (2004), but in contrast to him, I distinguish between speech proper and the representation of thoughts.

In the traditional treatment of reported discourse the distinction between **direct** and **indirect speech** has been given much attention. It is typical for dialect texts and other forms of spoken discourse that these two types are not distinguished neatly, and for the investigated texts the distinction seems to be of no importance. The use of participles in represented speech is no marker of "indirectness"; note that most instances of represented speech in example (1) are given in quotation marks, which by convention signal direct speech. The most reliable criteria for distinguishing types of reported discourse is the pronoun referring to the reported speaker: in direct speech, reference is made by a first person pronoun ("I", "we"), while in indirect speech the reported speaker is rendered as third person ("s/he", "they"). Some languages, including Latgalian, have a third possibility: the use of a special pronoun distinct from both "I" and "s/he". Such a device is called a **logophoric pronoun**, in Latgalian it is *szys*, cognate of the demonstrative pronoun *šis* in Low Latvian (see Nau 2006 for

⁴³ It is not necessary here to discuss the notion of finiteness, which of course is not that easy to define. For the current purpose the traditional treatment of participles as non-finite suits very well. Conditional and debitive forms, whose finiteness cannot be defined morphologically, as they have no person marking, do not matter for the distinction of narrative voice.

finite imperative:

- (5) *Wylks soka: "To liń tu ora!"* 'The wolf said: "Now creep out!"
 wolf:N says PTC creep:IMP.2SG 2SG:N out (23)

infinitive:

- (6) *Jis soka: "[...] Lejšt' tieŭ ora!"* 'He said: "[...] Creep out!" (53)
 he:N says creep:INF 2SG:D out

The infinitive has various other uses in the texts which will not be reviewed here for lack of space. The imperative function is restricted to represented speech, which, of course, may just reflect the obvious fact that it is unusual for the narrator to give orders to anybody. On the other hand, this restriction may also be connected to the origin of the construction: the imperative use of the infinitive may have developed from a structure where the infinitive was governed by a verb of speaking. The texts offer several examples that could be placed along a path from dependent infinitive within the voice of the narrator to its independent use in represented speech. Compare the following three sentences:

- (7) *soka jam nuza-wilkt' plykam* 'tells him to undress
 says he:D PFX:RFX-pull:INF naked:D
i acagult' upiś mólâ
 and PFX:RFX:lay:INF river:G border:L
 and **to lay** down at the bank of the river' (44)
- (8) *i radź, tur kaczejti mužiks* 'he sees, a farmer holds a little cat,
 and see:PRS:3 hold:PRS:3 cat:DIM:A farmer:N
soka pierkt' itu kaczejti nu szô
 says buy:INF DEM:A cat:DIM:A from LOG:G
 [he] **tells** [him] **to buy** this cat
 from **him** // [he] **says: buy** this cat
 from **me.**' (34)
- (9) *dud' jam tu naŭdu i raŭd* 'she gives him the money and
 give:PRS:3 he:D DEM:A money:A and cry:PRS:3
 begins to cry:
jaŭ: Ok tu, dieleń, klaŭsiat jaŭ szos,
 PTC IJE 2SG son:DIM:V listen:INF PTC LOG:F.G
 Oh, dear son, **listen to me,**
pierkt' kajdu litu,
 buy:INF some:A thing:A
buy something useful,
na-pierkt' kajdu nalitu!
 NEG-buy:INF some:A NEG:thing:A
don't buy anything useless!' (34)

In example (7) the infinitives, as well as the dative argument *jam* 'him', may be best interpreted as dependent on the verb *soka* 'says, tells', hence the English translation 'tells him to V'. Example (8) is syntactically ambiguous: the infinitive may be a complement of the verb *soka*, but it also is the predicate of a clause with a logophoric pronoun, an indicator of represented speech. In (9),

too, we find a logophoric pronoun, and the infinitives follow a term of address with a vocative, which unambiguously represents the voice of a character. In addition, the verb *raūd* 'crys, weeps' usually does not have an infinitive complement.

We may thus suppose a development where an infinitive loosens its ties with a governing verb of saying and becomes reanalyzed as the predicate of an independent clause, and a voicing device. However, synchronic variation is not a reliable criterion for the direction of a change. For all we know, the development could well have proceeded in the other direction, that is, from a formerly independent (though embedded) clause to a dependent infinitive complement:

? *soka pierkt* 'tells to buy' > *soka: pierkt!* 'says: buy!'

? *soka: pierkt!* 'says: buy!' > *soka pierkt* 'tells to buy'

3 Future participles

3.1 Morphology

Future participles contain the infinitive stem of the verb, a future suffix, a participle building suffix, and an ending for gender, number and case. As all attested forms are nominative, case will be ignored here.

The future suffix has the invariant shape <szk> ([šk]), where -sz- (š) is the reflex of the Baltic future marker and the insertion of -k- before the participle building suffix is an innovation occurring in part of the High Latvian dialect area (cf. Endzelin 1922: 725-6; Rudzīte 1964: 388).

The **active future participle** is marked by <ut> ([ūt]), <usz> ([ūš]), <ejt>, <ejsz>, or zero. An <i> between future suffix and <ejt> or <eisz> has no morphological significance, it reflects orthographic variation concerning palatalization:

stem meaning	stem	fut.	part.	ending	categories
'be'	byū	szk	–	ys	M.SG
'be'	byū	szk	ut	ia	F.SG
'eat'	je	szk	usz	sz	M.PL
'go'	i	szk	ejt	ia	F.SG
'do'	darie	szk	-i- ejt	s	M.SG
'eat up'	sa-je	szk	-i- ejsz	ys	F.PL

The so called **passive future participle** is marked by the suffix <am(a)>. It has no ending and may relate to noun phrases of both genders and presumably both numbers (all tokens relate to singular NPs). It is infrequent and always has an active meaning.

'be'	byŭ	szk	ama	–	
	byŭ	szk	am	–	
'haunt'	bidiej	szk	ama	–	

For further details on the forms see Leikuma (2001).

3.2 Use in represented speech

The overwhelming majority of future participles is found in represented speech, where it also is the most frequent of all participles. Over 200 tokens have been found in the texts. Quite often in a stretch of represented speech, past actions are referred to by finite forms, but future actions by participles, as in the following example:

- (10) *Kienińcz soka: "Tu braŭkoji jaŭ
king:N says 2SG go:PST:2SG PTC
piec wiepra, na doboji niko,
for hog:G NEG get:PST:2SG nothing:G
taj i putna na daboszkys!"
so and bird:G NEG get:FAP:M.SG*
- 'The king said: "You already went
for
the hog and didn't get anything,
so you **won't get** the bird neither!"
(52)

In most instances, future participles refer to future actions or states, but they are sometimes also used in contexts which rather suggest reference to the present, as in the following example with an echo question:

- (11) *Soka walns: "Woj ta tu dziejws?"
– "Dziejws!"
Diel kam na byŭszkys dziejws?"
for what:D NEG be:FAP:M.SG alive:M.SG*
- 'The devil asked: "Are you alive?"
– "Of course!
Why **shouldn't** [I] **be** alive?" (16)

Most often future participles relate to the participants of the represented speech act, that is, the reported speaker or the reported addressee. In clauses where the predicate is expressed by a future participle, a subject referring to the reported speaker most commonly is either expressed by a logophoric pronoun

(as in example (3) above), or not overtly expressed (ex. (11) and second line of ex. (13)). Sometimes a third person pronoun is used, as in indirect speech (*jis₁ soka, (ka) jis₁ iszkys* 'he₁ said (that) he₁ would go'). A combination of the future participle with a first person pronoun is never found in the texts, it may be impossible (*'es iszkys* 'I would/will go'). In contrast, the reported addressee is commonly referred to by a second person pronoun, as in direct speech (ex. (12)), or not overtly expressed (ex. (13), first line).

- (12) *It, it ji otkon, satiejk wucynu, - soka wucyns:* 'They go on and on, then they meet
"A kur jiūs iszkuszs?" a sheep, and the sheep asks them:
 PTC where 2PL go:FAP:PL "Where are **you** going?" (3)
- (13) *i wajcoj iz ju, woj klašieszkys?* 'and [she] asked him, will [you]
 and ask:PRS:3 to he:A QU listen:FAP:M.SG listen?
 – *Jis soka, ka klašieszkys!* He said that [he] would listen. '
 he:N says that listen:FAP:M.SG (38)

Note that in (13) neither speaker nor addressee are formally expressed, still there is no difficulty in understanding the referent. In general, in represented questions (*woj klašieszkys?*) the participle usually refers to the addressee.

Less often future active participles⁴⁴ relate to third persons, that is, non-participants of the represented speech situation. The main function of these participles clearly is within dialogues between characters of the tale. A sequence as in example (13) thus is more typical for their use in the texts than a complex sentence as in example (14):

- (14) *jis apjowieja pa wysom kieništiam, kas* 'he announced through all kingdoms
griebieszkys nubraukt' piec jo, daboszkys that whoever **wanted** to depart in
daūdž naūdys iz ciela, a kas atwieszkys jo, search of it [= the magic hog], **would**
daboszkys lytu moku. **get** a lot of money for the journey,
 and who **brought** it home, **would**
get payed off very well.' (52)

The tendency to use future active participles more often with reference to participants of the represented speech act can be observed in all fairytales. However, there is a measurable difference between different types of tales. At the beginning of the collection, there are several shorter stories where dialogues

⁴⁴ The few future **passive** participles found in the texts all relate to non-participants of the represented speech act.

make up a considerable proportion of the text – they are almost like dramas –, while later on, especially in the second half of the collection, the voice of the narrator dominates. This difference correlates with the relative dominance of participants over non-participants in represented speech, as well as with the overall frequency of the future active participle. Table 1 illustrates these findings.

	A (n = 34) tale 3, 8, 11, 12 ("dramatic" tales) about 7 pages	B (n = 62) tale 15 – 40 103 pages	C (n = 96) tale 41 – 53 103 pages
participants (repr. speaker / addressee)	91% (n = 31)	89% (n = 55)	70% (n = 67)
non-participants	9% (n = 3)	11% (n = 7)	30% (n = 29)

Table 1. Frequency of FAP referring to participants / non-participants of represented speech

3.3 Use outside of represented speech

Besides speech acts proper, many linguistic treatments of reported discourse include into this notion the rendering of thoughts, sometimes also knowledge and feelings. My notion of represented speech is more restrictive, represented thoughts, knowledge and feelings are excluded.

In the investigated texts, the rendering of the thoughts of a character generally does not involve voicing, and most clauses depending on verbs meaning 'to think' have finite predicates. Only in a few instances a clause with a non-finite predicate follows a verb of thinking, for example:

- (15) *Dumoj taūs: kas niū byūs* 'The father **thought**: what will
 think:PST:3 father:N what:N PTC be:FUT:3 come out of this?
nu to? ku jis darieszkys what **would he do**
 of DEM:G what:A he:N do:FAP:M.SG with such a daughter-in-law?' (1)
ar tajdu wadaklu?
 with such:A daughter.in.law:A

- (16) *Porgoja niediela, jis dumoj:* pass:PST:3 week:N he:N think:PRS:3
 "Nu, ti wociejszi byŭś mudri tia,
 PTC DEM:PL German:PL be:FUT:3 fast here
gribieszkusz at-jimt' naŭdu
 want:FAP:PL PFX-take:INF money:A
i zyrgs, byŭś bada! [...]"
 and horse:PL:A be:FUT:3 trouble:N
- 'A week passed, he **thought**:
 "Well, the Germans will be here
 soon,
 they **will want** to get back their
 money and the horses,
 there will be trouble! [...]" (21)

Note that in both these examples (and most of the other cases where the future participle is used in represented thoughts) the clause with the participle is the second in a chain of clauses, where the first clause has a finite predicate.

In these examples thoughts are linguistically, also graphically, treated like speech, which is common in many languages – however, in the texts under investigation such treatment is the exception. It should also be noted that the logophoric pronoun is never used in represented thoughts, it is reserved for acts of communication (speaking or writing).

While the two above examples might be considered instances of voicing in a broader sense (as we hear the inner voice of a character), I have also found two sentences where a description of the thoughts or feelings of a character quite clearly is given in the voice of the narrator. In one case, the governing verb is *sadumoj* 'thought (about doing sth.)', in the other it is *nuza-pricojas* 'was glad about', thus a verb depicting a feeling (ex. (17)).

- (17) *Jej ciszi nuza-pricojas, ka* 'She **was very glad** that
 she very PFX:RFX-be.glad:PST:3:RFX that
paza-grižkutia iz tawu atpakal she **should return** back to her
 PFX:RFX-turn:FAP:F.SG to father:A back father
i diewia jam soŭu gradzynu and gave:PST:3 he:D POSR:A ring:A
 and gave:PST:3 he:D POSR:A ring:A
- and gave him her ring' (50)

I doubt that here the use of the participle can be related to represented speech, it rather looks like a marker of subordination, though such a function is not otherwise attested in the texts.

A different case is the use of the future participle in deontic questions formulated in the voice of the narrator, but arguably representing the point of view of a character.

- (18) *ajzagrib jim ašt'* 'They got hungry,
 PFX:RFX:want:PRS:3 they:D eat:INF but what **should they eat?**' (5)
i ku ježszkuszsz?
 and what:A eat:FAP:M.PL

There are only three such examples, all found in fairytales 4 and 5 (presumably told by the same informant, note also the deontic question in example (15) from tale number 1).

The remaining instances of the future participle within the voice of the narrator (about 10 tokens) express a meaning oscillating between intention, volition and immediate future. Depending on the context, the future participle in these sentences can be translated as 'was about to x', 'wanted to x', 'got ready to x', 'began to x', 'in order to x' and the like (where "x" is the lexical meaning of the verb). Typically the particle *jaŭ* 'already' appears in the clause. Compare the following examples:

- (19) *A tys jaŭns kienińcz sa-swotoja* 'And the young king had got
 and DEM.M young:M king:N PFX- engaged with his princess, he **was**
 court:PST:3 **about to marry** and sent word to
soŭu kieniniejt, jaŭ ženieszkys Alexander, that he should come to
 POSR:A princess:A PTC marry:FAP:M.SG the wedding.' (48)
i syŭta piec Aleksandri,
 and send:PST:3 for Alexander:A
laj braŭć iz kozom.
 that go:PRS:3 to wedding:D
- (20) *riadź, ka wowiera łoksta* 'they saw a squirrel springing from
 see:PRS:3 that squirrel:N spring:PRS:3 tree to tree
nu kuka da kuka, - saŭszkuszsz jaŭ! – they **wanted to shoot** it' (9)
 from tree:G to tree:G shoot:FAP:PL PTC
- (21) *Wot jaŭ saŭszkuszsz, winu* 'They got ready to shoot and
 PTC PTC shoot:FAP:PL one:A sent one of them home to get a
nu-syŭta iż satu piec kotla kettle' (9)
 PFX-send:PST:3 to home:A after kettle:G

In some instances, the use of the future participle is ambiguous between this category of intention/immediate future and its main function as a voicing device. The following example can have both readings:

- (22) *A jis iz-kop nu ustobys,* And he climbs down from the attic
 and he PFX-climb:PRS:3 from hut:G – he **would go** pasturing now! (31)
jiszkys jaũ gonus! 'he got ready to go'
 go:FAP:M.SG PTC pasture:L 'he said he would go'

What distinguishes this example from (19) – (21) is that in the situation to which this sentence belongs there is another character present who could be the addressee of an utterance made by the hero⁴⁵. Nevertheless reading (i) is as plausible as reading (ii).

It is tempting to interpret the expression of an intended action in the immediate future as a secondary meaning of the future participle, derived from its basic function as a voicing device. There is no doubt a conceptual affinity between 'he declared he would x' and 'he intended to x' – someone who declares he will do something in the future will be understood as having the intention to do so. However, other facts speak against a diachronic development along these lines. It is important to note that the meaning of intention, or getting prepared to do something, is also expressed by a finite future, as in the following example, and this is even more common in the texts.

- (23) *suniejts iz-platia muti,* 'the dog opened his mouth wide,
 dog:DIM:N PFX-open:PST:3 mouth:A the cat **was about to**
jaũ kaczejts miašš mutiâ gradzynu **throw/wanted to throw** the ring
 PTC cat:DIM:N throw:FUT:3 mouth:L ring:A into his mouth – when he threw it,
 – *kaj jis miatia, krejt gradzyns jürô* the ring fell into the sea and sank!
 as he throw:PST:3 fall:PRS:3 ring:N sea:L (34)
i nu-šlejkst!
 and PFX-sink:PRS:3
- (24) *A ti diešmit jaũ saũšš ziamia* 'And the ten [Jews] **got ready to**
 and DEM:PL.M ten PTC shoot:FUT:3 down **shoot** the squirrel, all ten clasped
wowieri, wysi diešmit ap blisi the shotgun.' (9)
 squirrel:A all:PL.M ten around shotgun:A
apza-czieras
 PFX:RFX-gather:PST:3

This function of the finite future is known also from other dialects of Latvian, cf. Endzelin (1922:747): "bezeichnet ein solches Futurum [...] andererseits auch Handlungen, die zu tun man sich anschickt, beabsichtigt oder beginnt

⁴⁵ Actually, example (20) is ambiguous, too – the participle clause could be translated as "Let's shoot it!", understood as an utterance made by the heroes.

[...]. In der letzten Bedeutung z.B. noch *viña iscep* (Prs. histor.) *un êdís vakariñas* [...] 'sie bäckt aus und schickt sich an, das Abendbrot zu essen.'⁴⁶

The secondary meaning of the future participle thus is not dependent on its non-finiteness and the primary function as a voicing device, but belongs to the meaning range of the future tense in general.

4 Past active participles

Past active participles are derived from the past tense stem by a participle suffix and an ending for gender and number. The suffix has the variants <us> (/us/), <usz> (/uš/) and zero.

stem meaning	stem	part.	ending	categories
'be'	biej	–	is	M.SG
'plough'	ar	–	s	M.SG
'be'	biej	us	ia	F.SG
'see'	riedziej	us	ia	F.SG
'be'	biej	usz	i	M./F.PL
'sleep'	gulej	usz	i	M./F.PL

The past active participle differs from the future participles in that it is used more often outside of represented speech. As already noted above, in represented speech the past participles are used less often than future participles, but they are not infrequent. They are used with reference to both participants and non-participants of the represented discourse, and in contrast to the future participles discussed above there seems to be no preference for participants. Past active participles are most often combined either with the logophoric pronoun (ex. (25)) or a third person pronoun or noun, but they are also compatible with second and even first person pronouns (ex. (26)) which, as mentioned above, are not found with the future participle. The subject may also lack overt expression (second part of (27)).

⁴⁶ "on the other hand, such a future also expresses actions one is about to do, intends to do, or starts doing. For this last meaning compare, for example: *viña iscep* (historical present) *un êdís* [finite future, N.N.] *vakariñas* 'she finished baking and was about to eat dinner.'" (translation N. Nau)

- (25) *wysi nuza-spraŭstoja i soka:*
all:N.PL PFX:RFX-sigh:PST:3 and says
ak, kaj szy ilgi gulejuszi!
IJE how LOG:PL long sleep:PAP:PL
'they all snorted and said:
alas, how long **we** slept!' (33)
- (26) *[wylks] wajcoj:*
wolf:N ask:PRS:3
"Ku tu, kumień, ti runojusia?"
what:N 2SG pal:V here speak:PAP:F.SG
– *"A eś tu runojusia, kab ..."*
PTC1SG DEM:A speak:PAP:F.SG that
'[the wolf] asked:
"What did **you** say, my friend?"
– "Well, **I** said that ..."' (19)
- (27) *Iz-it walns i wajcoj:*
PFX-go:PRS:3 devil:N and ask:PRS:3
"Ap-arś tu jaŭ?"
PFX-plough:PAP:M.SG 2SG PTC
– *"Ap-arś!"*
PFX-plough:PAP:M.SG
'The devil came out and asked:
"Have **you** finished ploughing?"
– "Yes, [**I**] have." (16)

Outside of represented speech past active participles are used above all as converbs, relating a clause expressing an anterior action to a main clause with a finite predicate. This use is very frequent. In this function, only prefixed verbs are found, where the prefix – solely or in addition to a lexical meaning – functions as an aspectual marker.

- (28) *a jis ar,*
and he plough:PRS:3
ar da wokora jaŭ, [...]
plough:PRS:3 until evening:G PTC
ap-arś, at-it iz satu.
PFX-plough:PAP:M.SG PFX-go:PRS:3 to
home:A
'and he ploughed,
ploughed until the evening,
having finished ploughing [he]
went home. // [he] finished
ploughing and went home' (16)
- (29) *Jumprawys iz-maŭdojuszi,*
maiden:PL PFX-swim:PAP:PL
sieŭ kura gierbas
RFX PRO:F.SG dress:PST:3
'When the maidens had finished
swimming, they each of them
dressed.' (49)

In this function, the past active participle is also found inside of represented speech, thus narrative voice has no influence on its use. In most instances the converb relates to the subject of the main clause, but it may also refer to another person, as the following example shows:

- (30) *a jej soka taj, tiej siwa:* 'and the wife said [to her husband]:
and she says so, DEM:F.SG wife:N
"Wot szunakt na nu-gojis "Look, tonight, **when** [you] **didn't**
PTC tonight NEG PFX-go:PAP:M.SG **come** home to sleep,
iz satu gulatu, a son was born to me.' (53)
to home:A sleep:SUP
szej i dałs dzyma!"
LOG:F.SG.D PTC son:N be.born:PST:3

Another use of the past active participle in sentences belonging to the voice of the narrator is restricted to the participle of the verb *byūt* 'to be'; a clause with such a predicate describes a situation which is at the background of what happens or is going to happen in the story:

- (31) *Biejuszi gości pi kunga,* 'the lord had guests, he was
be:PAP:PL guest:PL at lord:G ashamed [in front of them]' (4)
jam kaŭns biejā (at that moment, when the cock
he:D shame:N be:PST:3 arrived)

With other verbs, the pluperfect is used in this function, that is, the past active participle combined with the past tense of the auxiliary *byūt* 'be':

- (32) *Iz-skriń rogonā, – jej* 'A witch rushed out, – she
PFX-run:PRS:3 witch:N she
biejā dziejwojusia tamā ustobieniā, was living in this little hut,
AUX:PST:3 live:PAP:F.SG DEM:L hut:DIM:L
– iz-skriń i soka: ... – rushed out and said:...' (29)
– PFX-run:PRS:3 and says:

In my eyes, the past active participle of 'to be' in example (31) stems from a pluperfect, abridged probably to avoid a combination of two forms from the same stem (< *biejā biejuszi*). The same function can be found at the beginning of a fairytale, where the background of a story may be given using a pluperfect (ex. (33)) or, in the case of the verb *byūt*, the past active participle alone (ex. (34)):

- (33) *Biejā dziejwojuszi wiećś ar* '[Once upon the time] there lived
AUX:PST:3 live:PAP:PL old.man:N with
wiaci – tiej wiacia – [one] night the old woman went
old.woman:A – DEM:F old.woman:N outside' (2)
iz-goja ora nakti...
PFX-go:PST:3 outside night:A ...

- (34) *Biejuszi motiaj trejs miejtys,* [Once upon a time] a mother had
 be:PAP:PL mother:D three daughter:PL three daughters
 – *wysis trejs saza-ladas* *i* – [one day] all three dressed up
 – all:PL.F three PFX:RFX-dress:PST:3:RFX and and went into the rosegarden to
goja iz ružu dorza doncot'. dance.'
 go:PST:3 to rose:G.PL garden:G dance:I (30)

As before, I interpret the participle in (34) as shortened from a pluperfect (< *bieja biejuszi*) which is used regularly in (33). The pluperfect and its abridged version do not express anteriority in the strict sense (actions happening or states existing prior to others), but a background from the point of view of the narrative. They get this function in contrast to the simple past tense used for the narration. It must be noted that the use of the pluperfect or the past participle of *byūt* for background situations is not frequent in the investigated fairytales, much more often we find the simple past in this function (as in example (1)), which contrasts with the present tense used for narrating the main events of the story.

5 Present participles

Present participles are comparatively rare in the texts. There are several tokens with the verb *byūt* 'to be' and some single instances of other verbs. Despite the low number of tokens, three groups can be distinguished morphologically, and at least two functions syntactically: voicing and converbs (with two subgroups). The base for all forms is the present tense stem.

- 1) Suffix <ut> (/ūt/), <ejt>, <ejsz>, or zero⁴⁷, plus ending expressing gender and number

stem meaning	stem	part.	ending	categories
'be'	as	–	s	M.SG.
'want'	grib	–	s	M.SG.
'die'	mierst	ut	ia	F.SG.
'be'	as	ejt	ia	F.SG.
'know'	zin	i- ejsz	i	PL

⁴⁷ Thus the same suffixes as with the future active participle. The variant <usz> (/uš/) is expected for plural forms, which are not attested.

These forms are used in represented speech in the same way as the future and past participles discussed above, a short example will suffice (recall also example (1), line g)):

- (35) *Siwa soka: "szy nazinejszi!"* 'The wife said: "We don't know!"
 wife:N says LOG:PL NEG:know:PA:PL (53)

In one instance, the participle may also be interpreted as a converb:

- (36) "[...] *Jej muna motia ciotka, –* 'My mother is an aunt to her, -
 she:D my:F mother:N aunt:N
mierstutia ziama prosa [she] **is dying** [and] wants //
 die:PA:F.SG down ask:PRS:3 **dying**, [she] wants
aca-sproszczatis ar ju! to bid farewell to her!' (17)
 PFX:RFX:bid.farewell:I:RFX with she:A

2) The same suffix as in 1), but no ending

stem meaning	Stem	ptc	ending
'live'	dziejwoj	ut	–
'lay'	gul	ejt	–
'run'	skrin-i	ejt	–

I have found so far 6 tokens, all are used as converbs outside of represented speech, 5 of them alongside a direct object (marked accusative or genitive, ex. (37) and (38)). It is suggestive that the only example without a direct object, representing a different syntactic construction (ex. (39)), is found in a closing formula. Such formulae sometimes show lexical or grammatical peculiarities which may be the result of language contact. For example, in all the texts the conjunction *un* 'and' is found only three times (the usual form for 'and' being *i*), two times of which in a closing formula, where it quite certainly corresponds to a Low Latvian model (where *un* is the usual form for 'and'). Similarly the construction with *dziejwojut'* in example (39) may reflect Low Latvian influence. A further hint is the use of *war byūt'* for 'maybe' – this form is rather rare in the texts, where 'maybe' usually is expressed by *može* (see Nau, forthcoming).

- (37) *Jis nu-it pacielu* 'He goes away and leaves them
 he:N PFX-go:PRS:3 away lying there' (9)
a jus pa-mat gulejt
 and they:A PFX-throw lie:PA
- (38) *Woj tu na riedzieji* "Didn't you see a girl running?"
 QU 2SG NEG see:PST:2SG (43)
kajdys miejtys skriniejt?
 some:G.F.SG girl:G run:PA
- (39) *Kas zyna, woj tiej praūda bieja,* 'Who knows whether this was the
 who:N know:PRS:3 QU DEM:F truth:N be:PST:3 truth,
a war byūt', ka dziejwojut' but maybe **living** (= during one's
 but may be:INF that live:PA lifetime)
i tropiejaš taj! such things happen!' (22)
 PTC happen:PRS:3:RFX so

3) Suffix <am(a)>, no ending

stem meaning	stem	ptc	ending
'be'	as	am	–
'be'	as	ama	–
'be able'	war	ama	–
'must'	wajag	ama	–

Participles with this suffix are traditionally called passive participles, which fits the situation in Modern Low Latvian and Lithuanian. It should however be noted that in the history of the Baltic languages, especially Latvian, participles with the suffix *-(a)m(a)-* (< *mo) were used not only with passive meaning (cf. Endzelin 1922: 778-784; Veidemane 2002: 452-457). In the investigated texts forms with this suffix are never passive and never combine with an ending. They are used exclusively in represented speech:

- (40) *"Nu, labi, dieleņ!*
 PTC well son:DIM:V "Well, sonny!
tagad wyss asama,
 now everything:N be:PP Now we have everything,
tik win zoboku naasama!"
 only alone boot:G.PL NEG:be:PP only boots are still lacking!"
- (41) *i at-skriņ walni, sok:* 'The devils came running and asked:
 and PFX-run:PRS:3 devil:PL say "What do you need?"' (34)
"Kô tieš wajagama?"
 what:G 2SG:D need:PP

The use of such "passive" participles in reported discourse is known also from parts of the Tamian dialect of Latvian (cf. Rudzite 1964: 241). As mentioned above, there are also future participles with this suffix, which, too, are used only as predicates in represented speech:

- (42) *i soka taj iz jus:* 'and he told them:
 and says so to they:A there will be no further haunting
wajra tia na bidiej-szk-ama here!
 more here NEG haunt-FUT-PART

The functions of the three participles discussed in section 3 – 5 are summarized in the following table.

Future participles	Past active participles	Present participles
voicing in represented speech (active and passive part.)	voicing in represented speech	voicing in represented speech (active declinable and passive part. = types 1) and 3))
extension of the voicing function in represented thoughts (active part.)		
clauses expressing intention, immediate future (active participle, + particle <i>jaũ</i>)	converb clauses expressing completed anterior actions (only prefixed verbs)	converb clauses expressing simultaneous states (active participles = types 1) and 2))
	backgrounding (only verb <i>byũt</i> 'to be', < pluperfect)	constructions with direct object (only active indeclinable part. = type 2))

Table 2. Occurrence of participles as predicates in Ulanowska's fairytales

6 Voicing, evidentiality, and modality

The use of participles as predicates in a context of reported discourse is a well known phenomenon in Baltic languages. However, as the reader familiar with other varieties of Latvian or with Lithuanian will have noticed, the use of participles in represented speech as described here differs considerably from the related languages and from what is commonly referred to as the oblique mood or *modus relativus*. The following facts are suggestive:

- 1) **Future** participles are the most frequent in represented speech, followed by past active participles, while present participles are rare.

In both Low Latvian and Lithuanian, the relative frequency of the types is different: past participles are most often used as predicates, while future participles, or the future tense of the oblique mood, show the lowest frequency.⁴⁸

- 2) Future participles most often refer to **participants** of the represented speech situation (recall table 1). Reference to reported speaker or addressee is also frequent with past participles. Reference to the reported speaker is regularly made by a logophoric pronoun, reference to the reported addressee by a second person pronoun. Also common in both cases is the absence of referring expressions.

I don't have comparable data for Low Latvian or Lithuanian, but I suppose that at least there is no preference for reported speaker and addressee when the oblique mood is used; there may be a preference for non-participants. Neither Low Latvian nor Lithuanian have a logophoric pronoun⁴⁹, in speech reports where the predicate is in the oblique mood both reported speaker and reported addressee are rendered as third persons, while first and second person pronouns exclusively refer to the actual speaker and addressee (which, of course, may be coreferent with a participant of the reported speech situation, but that's a special situation).

- 3) In the investigated texts, participles are often found in **questions**. Infinitives are used in **imperative sentences** in represented speech as a variant of finite imperatives (see section 2). Non-finite predicates do not interfere with markers of **mood and modality**: the conditional and the debitive are never combined with a participle, and the particle *laj* combines with the finite present tense (in reported commands and similar meanings).

In Low Latvian and especially in Lithuanian the oblique mood is used most often in statements. Direct questions with the oblique mood are possible in Low Latvian, but not frequent. In Low Latvian both the conditional

⁴⁸ For example, Eiche (1983) in her investigation of participles in Latvian fiction of the 1960s and 1970s counted 874 tokens of a past active participle used as a predicate without an auxiliary, but only 59 instances of participles ending in *-ot, -oties* (= present tense of the oblique mood) and 28 instances of participles ending in *-šot, -šoties* (= future tense of the oblique mood) (after Eiche 1983: 30 (table 3) and 38 (table 8)).

⁴⁹ In Low Latvian varieties the pronoun *šis* is occasionally found in this function, but it never shows the degree of conventionalization it has in High Latvian subdialects as the one described here, where the logophoric function is the only one and very regular.

and the debitive can be combined with the oblique mood, and for reporting commands the particle *lai* is used in combination with the present tense of the oblique mood.

These observations lead to the conclusion that the participles in the investigated texts do not represent the oblique mood. As already pointed out in section 1, the use of the participles does not imply indirect speech (*oratio obliqua*) as opposed to direct speech. Nor do these participles express evidentiality, a category subsumed under mood in traditional grammar as well as in some recent treatments of modality from a typological point of view⁵⁰. Evidentiality is concerned with "the nature of the sources of information which the speaker (or somebody else) has to assume or accept the existence of the state of affairs expressed in the clause" (Nuyts 2006: 10) – for example, whether the speaker has himself witnessed what he is talking about, or heard about it from someone else, or inferred it from some visual evidence⁵¹. Grammatical markers of evidentiality often display formal features which are grounded in the meaning of the category: (i) they are used only or overwhelmingly in statements, rarely in questions, (ii) they are most often found in past tense, but not so often in future tense, (iii) they are used more often with reference to third persons than first and second persons (Aikhenvald 2003: 15-17).

Voicing as described in this paper has nothing to do with source of knowledge for information, nor with expressing assertions. For example, when we hear the sentence *And then the fox said: "I am hungry"* within a fairytale, we are not informed that the fox is hungry and that the speaker (or the narrator) knows this because the fox told her so. A person telling a fairytale does not state anything, but incorporates in turn different instances that create a story: a narrator and characters. Turn-taking by (or rather, "turn-giving" to) these instances is a creative device for which special techniques have been formed in traditions of storytelling. In the Latgalian fairytales investigated, one such technique is the use of non-finite predicates, which are used in all kinds of sentences that may be uttered by a character, and consequently found in questions and commands as well as statements, often referring to the future

⁵⁰ Nuyts (2006: 10-11) gives a short overview of the discussion whether evidentiality is a kind of modality.

⁵¹ On evidentiality from a typological perspective see Aikhenvald 2003; 2004; Willet 1988; in Baltic languages: Holvoet 2007; in Lithuanian: Wiemer 2005; 2007.

(which is more interesting for the stories than the past) and to actions of the participants of the constructed speech situation.

Aikhenvald (2004: 135) proposed that "[r]eported evidentials and reported speech do essentially the same job: they indicate that the information was acquired from someone else." In my eyes, this is true only for certain types of what can be subsumed under "reported speech", but not for constructed dialogues of the kind described here or by Tannen (1986), where the job done by reported speech is to create drama, not to indicate the source of information. For a better understanding of the synchronic and diachronic relations between the category of evidentiality and the phenomenon of reported discourse, a more differentiated view of the latter is needed, taking into account its function in texts of different genres.

A comparison with Low Latvian and Lithuanian is also interesting with regard to functions in which participles are **not** used in Ulanowska's fairytales. This negative evidence gives further support to my claim that we are not dealing with the category of evidentiality here. Participles are not used in sentences where the narrator communicates traditional or hearsay knowledge ("people say", "I heard that"). In such a context, finite predicates are used, for example:

- (43) *Soka waci laūd's, ka na-war* 'Old people say that one mustn't
 says old:M.PL people that NEG-can:prs:3 sleep in the sauna, because they
piertī gulat', diel tam, ka, soka, say the devil is haunting there' (28;
 sauna:L sleep:INF for DEM:D that says 313)
ti walns bidiej.
 there devil:N haunt:prs:3

As pointed out several times in this paper, finite predicates are also used for the main body of the tale, told in the narrator's voice. Thus, we do not find participles in the so called "narrative" function which is known from several varieties of Latvian and Lithuanian and regarded as typical for fairytales. The few instances where a past active participle of the verb *byūt* 'to be' are found in the beginning of a tale or in the description of a background situation within the tale have been explained as shortened forms of a pluperfect (section 5, examples 31 and 34). One might assume that "narrative" and "voicing" function are mutually exclusive, but there are also Latvian dialects where both functions are found in the same fairytale. In this case the voicing

function is not very pronounced, and the use of non-finite predicates may become just a stylistic marker of epic folklore.

A further aspect characteristic of the oblique mood in both Latvian and Lithuanian, but absent in the texts under investigation, concerns epistemic overtones. In the Baltic languages the indication of the source of knowledge is not obligatory, therefore the use of the oblique mood often gives rise to implicatures whereby the hearer understands that the speaker is doubtful about the truth of the statement, or wishes to distance himself from the content. Such shades of meaning are not found in the fairytales. The modal nuances found with future participles outside of reported speech – intention, volition (see ex. (19) – (21) in section 3.3) – are not connected to the voicing function, but to future tense.

Finally, I don't want to conceal that I have found one sentence in the texts where a past active participle in addition to its voicing function clearly includes epistemic modality (in two other cases, an epistemic reading is possible, but not as clearly):

- | | | |
|------|--|---|
| (44) | <i>"Ok, Diwień! i duraks tia!</i>
IJE god:DIM:V PTC simpleton:N here
<i>niũ wysu naũdu zagli iz-zoguszi!"</i>
now all:A money:A thief:PL PFX:steel:PAP:PL | "Oh, Lord! The simpleton is here, too! Now thieves will have stolen all the money!" (31)
(the simpleton was supposed to stay at home and guard the money) |
|------|--|---|

This example is very interesting, and there are at least two ways to interpret it. First, the participle may be used here with an inferential meaning, as it is known from Lithuanian (cf. Ambrazas (ed.) 1997: 264). Such a meaning most probably would have derived from the perfect, thus it is connected to the tense rather than the non-finiteness of the predicate. Second, given the fact that inferred certainty elsewhere in the texts is occasionally expressed by a compound future⁵², which is also a regular expression means for this meaning in other varieties of Latvian, we may be faced with a case of auxiliary deletion: < *byũs iz-zoguszi*. '(will) have stolen'.

⁵² More often, inferred certainty is expressed by the epistemic particle *muszeń* 'certainly, most probably', see Nau (forthcoming).

7 Concluding remarks

In this paper it was shown that the use of non-finite predicates in the Latgalian fairytales is a voicing device, a technique used in constructed dialogues as part of a story. In the investigated texts, marking of the voice of a character as opposed to that of the narrator is the main function of future participles, and one of the main functions of past and present participles besides their use as converbs. In addition to participles, the infinitive is used as a non-finite predicate in represented speech, it appears in imperative sentences where participles are not used. I have argued that voicing is different from evidentiality and that functional differences between voicing and evidentiality account for formal differences in the use of participles as predicates in the investigated fairytales, on the one hand, and the oblique mood in Latvian and Lithuanian on the other. Furthermore, voicing is not related to modality; where secondary modal meanings have been found they were motivated by tense (future or perfect), not by the primary function of voicing.

A question for further investigation is how the data presented here fit into the picture of participles as predicates and the development of the oblique mood in Baltic. We witness here a special line of development which differs from the sister languages, but surely is related. Thus, the Latgalian data may shed new light on the origin of the oblique mood, which is a topic of much debate in Baltic linguistics (for overviews of the discussion and different approaches see Ambrazas 1990: 222-225; Wälchli 2000; Holvoet 2007: 92-96; 104). According to Ambrazas (1990: 226-228) the oblique mood and other participle constructions developed from the use of participles as (secondary) predicates in clause chaining. The data of the Latgalian fairytales fit to this thesis very well, and the use of participles in represented speech can be explained as just another special case within this general line of development, while the few cases where the future participle was found outside of represented speech may be relicts showing a pure clause chaining (converb-like) function. Further investigations into the syntax of these constructions will be needed. In any case, the Latgalian data should be taken into account in comparative studies.

ABBREVIATIONS

1, 2, 3	first, second, third person	NEG	negation
A	accusative	PA	present active participle
AUX	auxiliary	PAP	past active participle
CND	conditional	PART	participle
D	dative	PEX	prefix
DEM	demonstrative (pronoun)	PL	plural
DIM	diminutive	POSR	reflexive possessive pronoun
F	feminine	PP	present passive participle
FAP	future active participle	PRO	pronoun
FUT	future tense	PRS	present tense
G	genitive	PST	past tense
IJE	interjection	PTC	particle
IMP	imperative	QU	interrogative particle
INF	infinitive	RFX	reflexive
L	locative	SG	singular
LOG	logophoric pronoun	SUP	supinum
M	masculine	V	vocative
N	nominative		

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, H. Porter. 2002. *The Cambridge introduction to narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2003. Evidentiality in typological perspective. – A. Y. Aikhenvald & R.M.W. Dixon (eds.) *Studies in evidentiality*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 1-31.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas. 1990. *Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov*. Vilnius: Mokslas.
- Ambrazas, Vytautas (ed.) 1997. *Lithuanian grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos Lankos.
- Eiche, Aleksandra. 1983. *Latvian declinable and indeclinable participles. Their syntactic function, frequency and modality*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Endzelin, J[an]. 1922. *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga: Gulbis.
- Genette, Gérard. 1987. *Narrative discourse: An essay on method*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Holvoet, Axel. 2007. *Mood and modality in Baltic*. (Baltica Varsoviensia 6) Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Juško-Štekele, Angelika. 2001. Stefānija Uļanovska – izcila Latgales folkloras vācēja. P. Zeile (ed.) *Ai, māte Latgale. Atskati Latgales vēsturē un kultūrvēsturē*. [s.l.]: Annele. 329-344.
- Leikuma, Lidija. 2001. Par dažiem tagadnes un nākotnes aktīvajiem divdabjiem S. Uļanovskas pasakās. *Valoda – 2001. Humanitārās fakultātes XI zinātniskie lasījumi*.

- Daugavpils: Saule. 32 – 37. (also available at the web site of *Valsts valodas komisija*, <http://www.vvk.lv>; consulted Jan. 2007)
- Nau, Nicole. 2006. Out of Africa: Logophoric pronouns and reported discourse in Finnish and High Latvian dialects. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* LV (2006). 55-87.
- Nau, Nicole. *forthcoming*. Modality in an areal context: the case of a Latgalian dialect. To appear in: B. Wiemer et al. (eds.). *New insights into grammaticalization and language contact*.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2006. Modality: Overview and linguistic issues. – W. Frawley (ed.) *The expression of modality*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-26.
- Rudzīte, Marta. 1964. *Latviešu dialektoloģija*. Rīga: Latvijas Valsts izdevniecība.
- Soida, Emīlija. 1950. *Izloksnē uzrakstīto Viļānu pasaku valoda*. Diplomdarbs. Latvijas Valsts Universitāte.
- Stafecka, Anna. 2004. "Evangēlija toto anno.." (1753) and the development of the written word in Latgale. – *Evangēlija toto anno 1753. Pirmā latgaliešu grāmata*. Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts. 316-345.
- Tannen, Deborah. 1986. Introducing constructed dialogue in Greek and American conversational and literary narrative. – F. Coulmas (ed.) *Direct and indirect speech*. Berlin, New York, Amsterdam: Mouton de Gruyter. 311-332.
- Ulanowska, Stefania. 1895. Łotysze Inflant polskich, a w szczególności gminy Wielońskiej, powiatu Rzeżyckiego. Obraz etnograficzny. Część III. *Zbiór wiadomości do antropologii krajowej*, t. XVIII. (II Baśnie. 236-474).
- Vandelanotte, Lieven. 2004. Deixis and grounding in speech and thought representation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 36. 489-520.
- Veidemane, Ruta. 2002. Darbības vārds. In: K. Pokrotniece (ed.) *Latviešu literārās valodas morfoloģiskās sistēmas attīstība. Lokāmās vārdšķiras*. Rīga: LU Latviešu valodas institūts. 409-509.
- Wälchli, Bernhard. 2000. Infinite predication as a marker of evidentiality and modality in the languages of the Baltic region. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 54-3. 186-210.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2006. Grammatical evidentiality in Lithuanian (a typological assessment). *Baltistica* 41 (1). 33-49.
- Wiemer, Björn. 2007. Lexical markers of evidentiality in Lithuanian. *Revista di Linguistica* 19. 173-208.
- Willet, Thomas. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language* 12-1. 51-97.