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NON-FINITE PREDICATES AS A VOICING DEVICE IN STEFANIA ULANOWSKA’S LATGALIAN FAIRYTALES
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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 voice. 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):

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

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.
In this story finite and non-finite predicates are used very consequently: 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 forms\textsuperscript{43}. 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 "\textit{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 \textbf{direct} and \textbf{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 \textbf{logophoric pronoun}, in Latgalian it is szys, cognate of the demonstrative pronoun šīs in Low Latvian (see Nau 2006 for

\textsuperscript{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.
more details). Compare the following clauses from example (1), where the logophoric pronoun is best translated by an English first person pronoun:

(2)  *Ak, mamieť!*  szys  pat's
     i  ass  gars  pawasars!
     PTC  be:PA:M:SG long:M spring:N

(3)  *ku  tagad szy  jeszkuszi*

'Dear woman! I am myself the long spring!' (ex. (1-g))

When the reported speaker is referred to by the logophoric pronoun, reference to the reported addressee is made by a second person pronoun, as in direct speech:

(4)  *Dutu  szej  tieū  ašt'*
     give:CND  LOG:F:SG  2SG:D  eat:INF

'I would give you something to eat' (ex. (1-j))

Logophoric pronouns, too, are a voicing device, as they are used to mark the voice of a character. It is quite possible that the development of logophoric pronouns in High Latvian dialects is historically related to the development of participles as voicing devices – both may be a byproduct of syntactic changes concerning clause combining, both seem to be rooted in certain narrative traditions, and both have striking parallels in Baltic Finnic languages. This point will not be pursued here further. Instead, I will now turn to a more thorough description of the verb-forms found in represented speech.

2 Infinitives as imperatives

In represented speech, the infinitive is sometimes used as a predicate in the function of an imperative, for singular as well as plural addressees. In example (1), this could be seen in line (c). The addressee – the person ordered or asked to do something – may be expressed as a dative argument. Although in the investigated texts finite imperatives are more frequent, the infinitive is not unusual in this function. The following minimal syntactic pair shows the equivalence of the two constructions:
finite imperative:

(5) Wylks soka: "To liň  tu  ora!"  
   wolf:N says  PTC creep:IMP.2SG 2SG:N out

The wolf said: "Now creep out!" (23)

infinitive:

(6) Jis soka: "[...] Lejšť  tieũ  ora!"  
   he:N says  creep:INF 2SG:D out

   'He said: "[...] Creep out!" (53)

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 gov-
erned 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 sen-
tences:

(7) soka jam nuza-wilkū'  plykam
   says  he:D  PFX:RFX-pull:INF naked:D
   i  acagult'  upiš  mólă
   and  PFX:RFX:lay:INF  river:G  border:L

'tells him to undress
   and to lay down at the bank of the river' (44)

(8) i  radě,  tur  kaczęjti  mužiks
   and see:PRS:3 hold:PRS:3 cat:DIM:A farmer:N
   soka pierkt'  itu  kaczęjti  nu  szô
   says buy:INF  DEM:A cat:DIM:A from LOG:G

'he sees, a farmer holds a little cat,
   [he] tells [him] to buy this cat
   from him // [he] says: buy this cat
   from me.' (34)

(9) duď  jam  tu  naũdu  i  raũd
   give:PRS:3 he:D DEM:A money:A and cry:PRS:3
   jaũ:  Ok  tu,  dielen,  klaũsiat  jaũ  szôs,
   PTC  IJE  2SG  son:DIM:V  listen:INF  PTC  LOG:F:G
   pierkt'  kajdu  litu,
   buy:INF some:A thing:A
   na-pierkt'  kajdu  nalitu!
   NEG-buy:INF some:A NEG:thing:A

'he gives him the money and
   begins to cry:
   Oh, dear son, listen to me,
   buy something useful,
   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 raũd '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 <s> ([ś]), 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> ([ū]), <usz> ([ūš]), <ejet>, <ejsz>, or zero. An <i> between future suffix and <ejet> or <ejsz> has no morphological significance, it reflects orthographic variation concerning palatalization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stem meaning</th>
<th>stem</th>
<th>fut.</th>
<th>part.</th>
<th>ending</th>
<th>categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>byū</td>
<td>szk</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>ys</td>
<td>M.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>byū</td>
<td>szk</td>
<td>ut</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>F.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'eat'</td>
<td>je</td>
<td>szk</td>
<td>usz</td>
<td>sz</td>
<td>M.PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'go'</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>szk</td>
<td>ejt</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>F.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'do'</td>
<td>dari</td>
<td>szk</td>
<td>-i-</td>
<td>ejt</td>
<td>M.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'eat up'</td>
<td>sa-je</td>
<td>szk</td>
<td>-i-</td>
<td>ejsz</td>
<td>F.PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'be'</th>
<th>byû</th>
<th>szk</th>
<th>ama</th>
<th>–</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'haunt'</td>
<td>bidiej</td>
<td>szk</td>
<td>ama</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 braıkøjî jaï
king:N  says  2SG go:PST:2SG PTC
piec wiepra, na dobojî 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 wals:** "Woj ta tu dziejws?"
– "Dziejws!
Diel kam na byûszkys 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 (jis\_soka, (ka) jis\_1 iszkys 'he\_1 said (that) he\_1 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 wucymu, - soka wucyns:*  
"A kur ji\_s iszkusisz?"  
PTC where 2PL go:FAP:PL  
'They go on and on, then they meet a sheep, and the sheep asks them:  
"Where are you going?" (3)  

(13) *I wajcoj iz ju, woj kla\_siieszkys?*  
and ask:PRS:3 to he:A QU listen:FAP:M.SG  
-- *Jis soka, ka kla\_siieszkys!*  
he:N says that listen:FAP:M.SG  
'and [she] asked him, will [you] listen?  
He said that [he] would listen. '  
(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 kla\_siieszkys?) the participle usually refers to the addressee.

Less often future active participles\(^{44}\) 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 apjowjewa pa wysom kieni\_stiam, kas*  
gribieszkys nubraj\_t piec jo, daboszkys  
da\_d\_d na\_dy\_s iz ciela, a kas atwieszkys jo,  
daboszkys \_ylu moksu.  
'he announced through all kingdoms that whoever wanted to depart in search of it [= the magic hog], would get a lot of money for the journey, and who brought it home, would get paid 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A (n = 34)</th>
<th>B (n = 62)</th>
<th>C (n = 96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tale 3, 8, 11, 12</td>
<td>tale 15 – 40</td>
<td>tale 41 – 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&quot;dramatic&quot; tales)</td>
<td>103 pages</td>
<td>103 pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about 7 pages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participants (repr. speaker / addressee)</td>
<td>91% (n = 31)</td>
<td>89% (n = 55)</td>
<td>70% (n = 67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-participants</td>
<td>9% (n = 3)</td>
<td>11% (n = 7)</td>
<td>30% (n = 29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) **Dumoja** taũs: kas niũ byũs
    think:PST:3 father:N what:N PTC be:FUT:3
    nu to? ku jis *dariejskys*
    ar tajdu wadaklu? with such:A daughter.in.law:A

    'The father **thought**: what will come out of this?
    what would he do
    with such a daughter-in-law?' (1)
(16) Porgoja niediela, jis dumoj:
  pass: PST: 3 week: N he: N think: PRS: 3
  "Nu, ti wociejsz byūš mudri tia,
  PTC DEM: PL German: PL be: FUT: 3 fast here
  gribieszkušz at-jimt’ naūdu
  want: FAP: PL PFX-take: INF money: A
  i zyrgs, byūš 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 sadumo pj 'thought (about doing sth.)', in the other it is nūza-pricosas 'was glad about', thus a verb depicting a feeling (ex. (17)).

(17) Jej čišzi nūza-pricosas, ka
  she very PFX: RFX-be: glad: PST: 3: RFX that
  paza-grikoškia iz tawu atpakal
  PFX: RFX-turn: FAP: F. SG to father: A back
  i diešiu jam soūu gradzymu
  and give: PST: 3 he: D POSR: A ring: A

  'She was very glad that
  she should return back to her father
  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*  
  PFX:RFX:want:PRS:3 they:D eat:INF  
  *i ku ježszkuszę?*  
  and what:A eat:FAP:M.PL

'They got hungry,  
but what **should they eat**? (5)

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 *jaũ* 'already' appears in the clause. Compare the following examples:

(19) *A tys jaũs kienič sa-swotoja*  
and DEM.M young:M king:N PFX-court:PST:3  
soũu kieninjeji, *jaũ ženieszkys*  
POSR:A princess:A PTC marry:FAP:M.SG  
i syũta piec Aleksandi,  
and send:PST:3 for Alexander:A  
laj braũč iz kozom.  
that go:PRS:3 to wedding:D

'And the young king had got engaged with his princess, he **was about to marry** and sent word to Alexander, that he should come to the wedding.' (48)

(20) *riadž, ka wowiera łoķsta*  
see:PRS:3 that squirrel:N spring:PRS:3  
nu *kuka da kuka, - saũszkuszę jaũ!*  
from tree:G to tree:G shoot:FAP:PL PTC

'they saw a squirrel springing from tree to tree  
– they **wanted to shoot** it' (9)

(21) *Wot jaũ saũszkuszę, winu*  
PTC PTC shoot:FAP:PL one:A  
nu-*syũta iż satu piec kotla*  
PFX-send:PST:3 to home:A after kettle:G

'They got ready to shoot and sent one of them home to get a kettle' (9)

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 ubostys,
and he PFX-climb:PRS:3 from hut:G
jiszkys jaù gonus!
go:FAP:M.SG PTC pasture:L

And he climbs down from the attic – he would go pasturing now! (31)
'he got ready to go'
'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 hero. 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,
dog:DIM:N PFX-open:PST:3 mouth:A
jaù kacejets miašš mutià gradzynu
PTC cat:DIM:N throw:FUT:3 mouth:L ring:A
– kaj jis miatia, krej gradzyns jiûrò
as he throw:PST:3 fall:PRS:3 ring:N sea:L
i nu-šlejkst!
and PFX-sink:PRS:3

'the dog opened his mouth wide, the cat was about to throw/wanted to throw the ring into his mouth – when he threw it, the ring fell into the sea and sank!' (34)

(24) A ti diešmit jaù saûšš ziamia
and DEM:PL:M ten PTC shoot:FUT:3 down
wowieri, wysi diešmit ap blisi
squirrel:A all:PL:M ten around shotgun:A
apza-cziras
PFX:RFX-gather:PST:3

'And the ten [Jews] got ready to shoot the squirrel, all ten clasped the shotgun.' (9)

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 ēdis vakariñas [...] 'sie bäckt aus und schickt sich an, das Abendbrot zu essen.'

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stem meaning</th>
<th>stem</th>
<th>part.</th>
<th>ending</th>
<th>categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>biej</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>is</td>
<td>M.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'plough'</td>
<td>ar</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>M.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>biej</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>F.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'see'</td>
<td>riedziej</td>
<td>us</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>F.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>biej</td>
<td>usz</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>M./F.PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'sleep'</td>
<td>gulej</td>
<td>usz</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>M./F.PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ēdis [finite future, N.N.] vakariñas 'she finished baking and was about to eat dinner.'" (translation N. Nau)
Outside of represented speech past active participles are used above all as converses, 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 ploughed:PRS:3
ar da wokora jaũ, [...] plough:PRS:3 until evening:G PTC
ap-arš, at-it iz satu. PFX-plough:PAP:M.SG PFX-go:PRS:3 to home:A

(29) Jumprovys iz-maũdojuszi, 'When the maidens had finished
maiden:PL PFX-swim:PAP:PL swimming, they each of them
sieũ kura gierbas dressed.' (49)
RFX PRO:F.SG dress:PST:3

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 she says so, DEM:F.SG wife:N

"Wot szunakt na nu-gojis
PTC tonight NEG PFX-go:PAP:M.SG

iz satu gulatu,
to home:A sleep:SUP

szej i dals dzyma!"
LOG:F.SG.D PTC son:N be.born:PST:3

'and the wife said [to her husband]:

"Look, tonight, when [you] didn't come home to sleep,
a son was born to me.' (53)

Another use of the past active participle in sentences belonging to the voice of the narrator is restricted to the participle of the verb byût '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) Biejsuz gošti pi kunga,  
be:PAP:PL guest:PL at lord:G

jem kaũns bieja  
he:D shame:N be:PST:3

'the lord had guests, he was ashamed [in front of them]' (4)

(at that moment, when the cock 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 byût 'be':

(32) Iz-skriň rogona, – jej  
PFX-run:PRS:3 witch:N she

bieja dziejwojusia tamá ustobienią,  

– iz-skriň i soka: ...  
– PFX-run:PRS:3 and says:

'A witch rushed out, – she

was living in this little hut, – rushed out and said:....' (29)

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 (< bieja biejsuzi). 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 byût, the past active participle alone (ex. (34)):

(33) Bieja dziejwojuszi wiećiš ar  
AUX:PST:3 live:PAP:PL old.man:N with

wiaći – tiej wiacia  
old.woman:A – DEM:F old.woman:N

iz-goja ora nakti...  
PFX-go:PST:3 outside night:A ...

'[Once upon the time] there lived an old man and his wife

– [one] night the old woman went outside ....' (2)
(34) **Biejuszi** motiaj tres miejty,  
be:PAP:PL mother:D three daughter:PL  
– wysis tresi saza-ladas
– all:PL:F three PFX:RFX-dress:PST:3:RFX and  
goja iz ružu dorza doncot'.
go: PST:3 to rose:G.PL garden:G dance: I  

‘[Once upon a time] a mother had three daughters  
– [one day] all three dressed up and went into the rosegarden to dance.’ (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 conversbs (with two subgroups). The base for all forms is the present tense stem.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stem meaning</th>
<th>stem</th>
<th>part.</th>
<th>ending</th>
<th>categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>M.SG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'want'</td>
<td>grib</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>M.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'die'</td>
<td>mierst</td>
<td>ut</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>F.SG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>ejt</td>
<td>ia</td>
<td>F.SG.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'know'</td>
<td>zin</td>
<td>i—ejsz</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

47 Thus the same suffixes as with the future active participle. The variant <usz> (/ūš/) 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) *Stwa soka: "szy naziniejszi!"*  
wife:N says LOG:PL NEG:know:PA:PL  
'The wife said: "We don't know!"  
(53)

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

(36) "[...] *Jej muna motia ciotka, –*  
she:D my:F mother:N aunt:N  
mierstutia ziana prosa  
die:PA:F.SG down ask:PRS:3  
aca-sproszcziś ar ju!  
PREFIX:RXF:bid.farewell:1:RXF with she:A  
*[she] is dying [and] wants // dying, [she] wants to bid farewell to her!* (17)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stem meaning</th>
<th>stem</th>
<th>ptc</th>
<th>ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'live'</td>
<td>dziejwoj</td>
<td>ut</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'lay'</td>
<td>gul</td>
<td>ejt</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'run'</td>
<td>skrin-i</td>
<td>ejt</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have found so far 6 tokens, all are used as convertas 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
   lying there' (9)

   he:N PFX-go:PRS:3 away
   a jus pa-mat guleji
   and they:A PFX-throw lie:PA

(38) *Woj tu na riedziej*
   "Didn't you see a girl running?"
   QU 2SG NEG see:PST:2SG
   kajdys miejscy skrinieji?
   some:G.F.SG girl:G run:PA

(39) *Kas zyna, woj tiej prauda bieja,*
   'Who knows whether this was the
   who:N know:PRS:3 QU DEM:F truth:N be:PST:3
   a war by’t, ka dziejwojut'
   but may be:INF that live:PA
   but maybe living (= during one's
   i tropiejaś taj!
   such things happen!' (22)

   PTC happen:PRS:3:RFX so

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stem meaning</th>
<th>stem</th>
<th>ptc</th>
<th>ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>am</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be'</td>
<td>as</td>
<td>ama</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'be able'</td>
<td>war</td>
<td>ama</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'must'</td>
<td>wajag</td>
<td>ama</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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!*
   "Well, sonny!
   PTC well son:DIM:V
   tagad wyss asama,
   now everything:N be:PP
   tik win zoboku naasama!"
   only alone boot:G.PL NEG:be:PP

(41) *i at-skriņ walni, sok:*
   'The devils came running and asked:
   and PFX-run:PRS:3 devil:PL say
   "Kō tieū wajagama?"
   what:G 2SG:D need:PP
   "What do you need?" (34)
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) * soka taj iz jus: 
    and says so to they:A

    wajra tía na * bidiej-szk-ama
    more here NEG haunt-FUT-PART

"and he told them:
there will be no further haunting here!"

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future participles</th>
<th>Past active participles</th>
<th>Present participles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voicing in represented speech (active and passive part.)</td>
<td>voicing in represented speech</td>
<td>voicing in represented speech (active declinable and passive part. = types 1) and 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extension of the voicing function in represented thoughts (active part.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clauses expressing intention, immediate future (active participle, + particle jau)</td>
<td>verb clauses expressing completed anterior actions (only prefixed verbs)</td>
<td>verb clauses expressing simultaneous states (active participles = types 1) and 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>backgrounding (only verb byût 'to be', &lt; pluperfect)</td>
<td>constructions with direct object (only active indeclinable part. = type 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.  

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 pronoun, 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 lai 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 -isot, -isoties (= 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 investi-
gated 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 cat-
egory subsumed under mood in traditional grammar as well as in some recent
treatments of modality from a typological point of view. Evidentiality is con-
cerned 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 evidence. 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
(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
    says old:M.PL people that NEG-can:prs:3
    pierītī gulat', diel tam, ka, soka,
    sauna:L sleep:INF for DEM:D that says
    ti walns bidiej.
    there devil:N haunt:prs:3

'Old people say that one mustn't sleep in the sauna, because they say the devil is haunting there' (28; 313)

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 whishes 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) "Ok, Diwień! i duraks tia! "Oh, Lord! The simpleton is here, IJE god:DI:M PTC simpleton:N here too! Now thieves will have stolen niū wysu naïdu zagli iz-zoguszi!" 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. Ambrázas (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 future\footnote{More often, inferred certainty is expressed by the epistemic particle muszėń 'certainly, most probably', see Nau (forthcoming).}, 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: < byūs iz-zoguszi. 'will have stolen'.

\footnote{More often, inferred certainty is expressed by the epistemic particle muszėń '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 converses. 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
A accusative
AUX auxiliary
CND conditional
D dative
DEM demonstrative (pronoun)
DIM diminutive
F feminine
FAP future active participle
FUT future tense
G genitive
IE interjection
IMP imperative
INF infinitive
L locative
LOG logophoric pronoun
M masculine
N nominative
NEG negation
PA present active participle
PAP past active participle
PART participle
PL plural
POSR reflexive possessive pronoun
PP present passive participle
PRO pronoun
PRS present tense
PST past tense
PTC particle
QU interrogative particle
RFX reflexive
SG singular
SUP supinum
V vocative
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