AGO KÜNNAP (Tartu)

ON THE ANALYTICAL PAST TENSE FORMS IN THE URALIC LANGUAGES

The Uralic languages are known to have analytical (compound, periphrastic) past tense forms. A description of the forms used in Finno-Ugric languages and a review of works on the subject was drawn up by Klara Majtinskaja in her manual of Finno-Ugric morphology (Майтинская 1979).

She grouped the analytical tense forms of Finno-Ugric languages into the western and the eastern types. In the forms of the western type the auxiliary verb, which is conjugated, combines with an unchangeable form of the principal verb. In the eastern type the auxiliary verb is unchangeable, and it is the principal verb that is conjugated. In both types the auxiliary verb is predominantly represented by the verb 'to be'. The western type, according to Majtinskaja, covers the Balto-Finnic, Lapp and Mordvin languages, the eastern type — the Permic languages and Hungarian. (Concerning the Mordvin languages it is but an assumption that the present-day simple forms have developed from analytical ones.) In Mari both types exist (at least in dialects). The Balto-Finnic and Lapp forms are said to be similar to their counterparts in Germanic and Baltic languages as well as to the Russian forms that are obsolete now. The eastern type, according to Majtinskaja, can have developed under the influence of Turkic language (Майтинская 1979 : 50—59).

Majtinskaja's review is to be complemented by what Valter Tauli writes on the subject. In his book on structural tendencies in the Uralic languages there is also a part dealing with analytical past tense forms (Tauli 1966 : 72—79). He notes that the analytical tendency within the verb category of both the Uralic and the Indo-European language families is most prominently expressed in the emergence of the analytical verb forms which tend to replace the old simple forms. Tauli begins his survey with the perfect and pluperfect of the Balto-Finnic and Lapp languages and draws attention to the fact, that the late loss of the copula 'to be' in analytical forms of various Balto-Finnic languages is known to have taken place in German, too.

Tauli thinks that cases of the absence of the copula in Lapp reflect, at least partly, traces of the original state, since in the Uralic languages, as in many others, the participle can fulfil the function of a finite verb form, especially in expressing the past action, e.g. Komi-Zyrian *munęm* 'gone; has gone', Hungarian *várt* 'waited; he waited'. The analytical tense forms under consideration in the verb systems of the Balto-Finnic and Lapp languages may have partly occurred under the influence of Germanic languages and particularly with the loss in those languages of the old nominal sentences having no copula.

Tauli points out that in Mari quite a number of past tense forms are built with the help of the copula 'to be'. There is a form of the perfect

which consists of the gerund in -*n* of the principal verb, followed by the copula 'to be', e.g. *konden ulna* 'we have carried'. The majority of analytical past tense forms in Mari contain a finite form of the principal verb, followed by the 3rd person singular of the copula 'to be', e.g. *mijenam ǝle* 'I went' (perfect of the principal verb + 'was'). This combination is also used in the Permic languages, e.g. Udmurt *mon bǝdtem vaḷ* 'I had finished'. In the Udora dialect of Komi-Zyrian the copula may be placed before the principal verb, e.g. *me vęli męda* 'I was going'; such a sequence can be found in the Komi-Zyrian literary language too. Tauli refers to the viewpoint of Boris Serebrennikov that the past tense forms containing 'was' express: 1) the imperfect (durative) aspect and 2) modus emphaticus, and that the same notions are expressed by the analytical past tense forms in Tatar and Bashkir. Concerning Hungarian Tauli mentions the past tense forms consisting of a finite form of the principal verb and the copula 'was', e.g. *íra vala* 'wrote, had written' (imperfect + 'was').

The origin of the Mari, Permic and Hungarian analytical forms consisting of a finite form of a principal verb and a finite form of a copula seems obscure to Tauli. Some authors consider them to go back to the time when part of verb forms still functioned both as a verbal noun and a finite verb form. Thus the Komi-Zyrian *munę* may then have meant both 'going' and 'went'. Consequently, the present-day *munę vęli* 'went' at that time could mean 'going was', but it could as well be understood as 'went was'. The latter interpretation could well stimulate the use of the other finite forms, in addition to the 3rd person. However, the analytical tense forms under consideration in Mari, Permic and Hungarian are, according to Tauli, inseparable from their counterparts in the neighbouring Turkic languages.

There is another group of analytical past tense forms in Hungarian, consisting of a finite form of the copula 'to be', followed by the verbal noun in -*va*, -*ve* of the principal verb, e.g. *vagyok feletkëzve* 'I have forgotten'. As the copula in Hungarian is generally lacking, it can be omitted in these cases too, e.g. *fiam elmenve* 'my son has gone away'.

In the end Tauli draws attention to the fact that in Asiatic languages — in addition to the so-called Altaic languages — analytical past tense forms containing the copula 'to be' are to be found in Dravidian and Burushaski languages.

I think it necessary to take into consideration the sequence of the auxiliary and principal verbs in the analytical past tense forms of Finno-Ugric languages. In the Balto-Finnic and Lapp the auxiliary verb precedes the principal one, e.g. Estonian *olen lugenud* 'I have read', *olin lugenud* 'I had read', Lapp Polmak *læm gullâm* 'I have heard', *leggjim gullâm* 'I had heard' (Майтинская 1979 : 51—52). In Vepsian the auxiliary verb may, as an exception, follow the principal one, e.g. *mä jänu oḷiň* 'I had stayed' (Tauli 1966 : 73). In the other Finno-Ugric languages, however, beginning with Mordvin, the auxiliary verb in analytical past tenses almost always stands in the postposition, for example, on the one hand (i.e. a non-finite form of the principal verb + a finite auxiliary verb), Erza Mordvin *морылинь* 'I was singing' (non-finite form of the principal verb + *улинь* 'I was'?), *морылить* 'you were singing', etc.; Meadow Mari *толын улам* 'I have come', *толын улада* 'you have come', etc.; but on the other hand (i.e. a non-finite form of the principal verb + non-finite form of the auxiliary verb), Mari (literary language) *лудам ыле* 'I have read', *лудат ыле* 'you have read', etc.; Komi-Zyrian *муна вӧлі* 'I have gone', *мунан вӧлі* 'you have gone', etc.; Hungarian *irok vala*

'I have written', *irsz vala* 'you have written', etc. (Майтинская 1979 : 53—58). Thus, as far as the sequence of the components is concerned, the borderline between the eastern and western types lies westward from the Mordvin linguistic area.

It can be concluded that both the Mordvinian and Mari languages present an intermediate stage between the western and eastern types. In the so-called purely eastern type itself — the Permic and Hungarian languages — the use of analytical past tense forms is much more limited than in the western type. Virtually missing in it is also the triple system of those tenses — imperfect, perfect, pluperfect — which is characteristic of the western type. The Ob-Ugrian languages, according to the data available at present, do not seem to have analytical past tense forms at all.

On analytical past tense forms in Samoyed languages there is very little evidence in works dealing with Uralic languages; neither is there any general survey on them. In the following I shall give a review on the subject.

Kazys Labanauskas has been intensively studying and describing the system of tenses in the North Samoyed languages for more than ten years and has surveyed the previous standpoints. His works provide us with some new data. First of all, Labanauskas points to the existence of the triple system of past tenses in Nenets and Enets — besides the simple past tense form in *ś* (imperfect) there are perfect and pluperfect. The perfect has the marker $\beta i, mi$ in Nenets and $b'i, pi$ in Enets, the pluperfect — $\beta i, \beta e, mi, me \ldots ś$ in Nenets and $b'i, pi \ldots ś, ś(i)$ in Enets (between the components personal endings are placed) (see especially Лабанаускас 1974; 1982). The markers $\beta i, mi$ and $b'i, pi$ apparently originate from the Proto-Samoyed marker of the past participle. Whether it was an $*m$- or $*p$-marker is not quite clear — one can assume that the two variants in their usage blended into one. On the basis of the data available at present, I would hypothetically reconstruct it as $*m$. It must have been a compound marker, with $*j$ as the second element ($*m + *j$). Besides, originally the pluperfect can have been an analytical tense form: the word final component $ś, ś, ś(i)$ could be considered a remnant of the suffixal form $*ś$ that belonged to the verb 'to be' (see Кюннап 1976 : 173—178), even though, regrettably, no traces have survived of the stem $*V$- of the verb 'to be' in these past tense forms either in Nenets or Enets. (Assuming this I do not mean that each present-day form has once had the clitic $*V-śV$. I only suppose that the $ś$-element, which at present is added to personal endings, may have derived from that early form).

Here are some examples of the above-mentioned perfect and pluperfect forms, drawn by Labanauskas. Perfect: Nenets $ta-\beta e-n$ 'you have given', $tarp-\beta i-d$" 'they have come out'; Enets Maddu $sero-b'i-\delta a$ 'he has bound', Bai (Mikola) $diri-bi$ 'he has lived'; pluperfect: Nenets $pin-\beta e-\delta amt-ś$ 'I had feared', $pin-\beta e-na-ś$ 'you had feared', $pin-\beta i-ś$ 'he had feared', etc.; Enets Maddu $kode-bi-\delta od-ś$ 'I had frozen', $kode-b'i-ddo-śi$ 'you had frozen', $kode-bi-śi$ 'he had frozen', etc. The pluperfect forms here end in $ś(i)$, which is supposedly a trace of the verbal noun form $*V-śV$ of the auxiliary verb 'to be'.

Toivo Lehtisalo in his lectures in 1938 mentioned a past tense form in Nenets, which derived from a verbal noun in $*m$, e.g. $ŋǎèββv$. It generally means 'being', but in the conjugation paradigm it has acquired the function of a narrative preterite with the meaning 'was, has been'. Further

Lehtisalo noted that the participle in *m* in Nganasan can also be con-
jugated, e.g. (Castrén) *sadabtuma'am* 'I am wrapped in' (Lehtisalo
1938; cf. also Lehtisalo 1936 : 106—110).

Though in Nganasan there are some traces of the past tense in *m*
(interrogative forms with the marker *bi̯*), there the past tense is gene-
rally conveyed by the marker *$\acute{s}$*. But Labanauskas also mentions the
marker of the perfect in Nganasan: *-b*(V)(*-h*V) + *-t*(δ)V, and illustra-
tes it by the following examples: *mej-hā̈δi̯* 'he has done, as it turns out',
nə̇ŋhum-hātu 'he has grown angry, as it turns out', *bū-bata-δə* 'he has
left, as it turns out' (Лабанаускас 1975 : 197—198). Apparently this can
also be related to the verbal noun in **m*. If it is so, the system of perfect
tenses, formed in Nenets and Enets with the help of the **m*-participle,
could be assumed for Nganasan, too. In this case it would be possible
to speak about a feature common for all the North Samoyed languages
— the perfect tense, which has derived from the verbal noun in **m*.

The Nenets and Enets imperfect in *$\acute{s}$*, where formant *$\acute{s}$* follows the
personal ending like in pluperfect, originally must have been analytical,
too. E.g. Forest Nenets (Sammallahti) *ka̧dā̈-tta̧-$\acute{s}$* 'I left, went',
ka̧dā̈-nna̧-$\acute{s}$ 'you left, went', *ka̧dā̈-$\acute{s}$* 'he left, went', etc. (Sammallahti
1974 : 72—73); Enets (Prokof'jev) *jire-dod̦-d̦* (< **-$\acute{s}$*) 'I lived', *jire-do-$\acute{s}$*
'you lived', *jire-$\acute{s}$* 'he lived' etc. (Прокофьев 1937 : 89).

As far as the South Samoyed languages are concerned, in Selkup
there seem to be no analytical past tense forms, and in Kamassian the
compound suffix **m* + **j* has become a general marker of the past tense
(in the North Samoyed languages it is known to be the marker of the
perfect). E.g. (Donner) *pārgə-bi* 'he cut'. In some cases this marker was
joined by another **j*-suffix, e.g. (Donner) *pārgə-bi-i̯ȧ-m* 'I cut'. There are
no other past tense forms in the conjugation paradigm of Kamassian.
But there does exist in the language a gerund form, which expresses an
action prior to another action and the formation of which may have been
as follows: the preterite participle, having had the formant **m* + **j*,
was joined by the auxiliary verb 'to be' in the form **i-zɛ* (< **V-$\acute{s}$V),
e.g. (Donner) *ma'andə šō-bizɛ i̯i̯andə nɛ̧rbəli̯ȧ* 'having come
home he told his mother' (< *šōbi* + **izɛ*), *di ńim ku-biza tu̧nōldə-
la̧_šobi* 'having seen the boy he came at a trot' (< *ku̧bi* + **izɛ*)
(Donner-Joki 1944 : 172, 179; see also Künnap 1978 : 128—142, 160—167).
This form may be considered to correspond to the pluperfect of the North
Samoyed languages.

The above data on the Samoyed languages shows that analytical past
tense forms have once been used in these languages too — especially in
the North Samoyed languages — and in some of them there has even
been a triple system: imperfect, perfect and pluperfect, of which only
the third was analytical in the majority of cases. Those analytical forms
of the Samoyed languages are to be referred to the purely eastern type,
as they consist of a finite form of the principal verb followed by a non-
finite form of the auxiliary verb.

In the literature on the subject it has been repeatedly stated that
analytical past tenses of the purely eastern type in Finno-Ugric lan-
guages developed under the influence of Turkic languages. But one
should not overlook the following peculiarity here: although in Turkic
languages the copula 'to be' indeed follows the principal verb, yet it is
conjugated and the principal verb is unchanged, while in the eastern
type of Uralic forms it is the principal verb that his conjugated and the

copula remains unchanged. Cf. e.g. Tatar *бара идем* 'I went', *бара идеӊ* 'you went', *бара иде* 'he went', etc. (ЯН 1966 : 147); Tatar Baraba *алӊан идим* 'I have taken', *алӊан идиӊ* 'you have taken', *алӊан иди* 'he has taken', etc. (166—167); Bashkir *барѓайным* 'I have gone' (< **барѓан инем*); Uzbek *шилаб эдин* 'I have worked', *шилаб эдинг* 'you have worked', *шилаб эди* 'he has worked', etc. (351). The present participle of the principal verb, followed by finite forms of the auxiliary verb 'to be', was probably used to express the past continuous aspect as far back as in Proto-Turkic (see especially Серебренников, Гаджиева 1986 : 172—175).

Analysing the origin of the emphatic continuous past tense form in Mari, Serebrennikov also notes that the Mari forms *лудам ыле* 'I was reading (then)', *лудат ыле* 'you were reading (then)', *лудеш ыле* 'he was reading (then)', etc., cannot have developed under the influence of Turkic languages such as Bashkir and Tatar, because in Turkic languages it is the copula that is inflected here, but not the principal verb ((ИТИ 1978 : 15—16). The same author had earlier suggested that the forms of pluperfect in Udmurt *myni val* 'I went, had gone', *mynid val* 'you went, had gone', *myniz val* 'he went, had gone', etc. had developed under the influence of the pluperfect in Tatar, and pointed out that Tatar dialects and a Chuvash dialect had pluperfect forms of the same type, e.g. Tatar *aldym ide* 'I had taken', *aldyŋ ide* 'you had taken', *aldy ide* 'he had taken', etc. (Серебренников 1960 : 268—269; 1963 : 268—269). However, the above-mentioned forms used in the Tatar and Chuvash dialects neighbouring on Finno-Ugric languages are probably rather exceptional, and it is more likely that they have developed under the influence of Finno-Ugric languages, not vice versa. Thus it seems that exact counterparts of the original Turkic model can only be found in the Mordvin and Mari languages, although Gennadij Tužarov assumed that the dialectal Mari type with the inflected copula 'to be', as in Jarang *sire·n ṇ·lṇm* 'I wrote', *sire·n ṇ·lṇc* 'you wrote', *sire·n ṇ·lö* 'he wrote', etc., or Meadow Mari (Reguly) *tolon el'em* 'I came', *tolon el'eč* 'you came', *tolon el'e* 'he came', etc., had been characteristic of Old Mari already and related to the Balto-Finnic pluperfect (Тужаров 1966). Yet it is more obvious that these Mari forms, as well as the originally analytical forms in the Mordvin languages, correspond to the type commonly used in Turkic languages, and the correspondence is quite accurate.

Serebrennikov also scrutinized the possibility of independent development of the common features in the systems of past tense forms in the Finno-Ugric and the Turkic languages of the Volga-Kama basin. He suggested that due to close contacts between the languages of the two families these features could have survived better than elsewhere (Серебренников 1960 : 288—289). According to Serebrennikov, analytical past tense forms must have developed later than the Finno-Volgaic period (ФВЯО 1989 : 15). Majtinskaja points out that in Hungarian the process of combininig a non-finite form of the auxiliary verb with non-finite form of the principal verb, which led to the formation of analytical past tense forms of the eastern type in Uralic languages, had begun long before Hungarians came to the Danube basin. For a proof she refers to the oldest written text in Hungarian (late 12th century), which records this type: *es o d u t t a v o l a neki paradisumut* 'and g a v e him paradise' (Майтинская 1979 : 58). Ancestors of Hungarians are known to have had close contacts with Turkic tribes at that period. So the Turkic influence upon Hungarian at the time was apparently more intensive than upon other Uralic languages. However, one can also assume that this type of an analytical past tense form is a very old Uralic phenomen.

The fact that analytical past tense forms of the purely eastern type are characteristic of the Samoyed languages, too, testifies to his assumption and challenges the plausibility of the mere late Turkic influence upon the development of forms of the eastern type.

LITERATURE

D o n n e r, K., J o k i, A. J. 1944, Kamassisches Wörterbuch nebst Sprachproben und Hauptzügen der Grammatik, Helsinki.
K ü n n a p, A. 1978, System und Ursprung der kamassischen Flexionssuffixe II. Verbalflexion und Verbalnomina, Helsinki (MSFOu 164).
L a b a n a u s k a s, K. 1975, Das Präsens im Nganassanischen. — СФУ XI, 122—125.
L e h t i s a l o, T. 1936, Über die primären ururalischen ableitungssuffixe, Helsinki (MSFOu LXXII).
—— 1938, Lectures in Helsinki University. (Manuscript by A. J. Joki.)
S a m m a l l a h t i, P. 1974, Material from Forest Nenets, Helsinki (Castrenianumin toimitteita 2).
T a u l i, V. 1966, Structural Tendencies in Uralic Languages, London — The Hague — Paris (UAS 17).
Историко-типологические исследования по финно-угорским языкам, Москва 1978 (= ИТИ).
К ю н н а п А. 1976, К проблеме происхождения показателей наклонений и времен в уральских языках. — СФУ XII, 169—181.
Л а б а н а у с к а с К. 1974, Ненецкий перфект. — СФУ X, 45—52.
—— 1982, К изучению прошедших времен ненецкого и энецкого языков. — СФУ XVIII, 125—134.
М а й т и н с к а я К. Е. 1979, Историко-сопоставительная морфология финно-угорских языков, Москва.
П р о к о ф ь е в Г. Н. 1937, Энецкий (енисейско-самоедский диалект). — Языки и письменность народов Севера I, Москва, 75—90.
С е р е б р е н н и к о в Б. А. 1960, Категории времени и вида в финно-угорских языках пермской и волжской групп, Москва.
—— 1963, Историческая морфология пермских языков, Москва.
С е р е б р е н н и к о в Б. А., Г а д ж и е в а Н. З. 1986, Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков, Москва.
Т е р е щ е н к о Н. М. 1973, Синтаксис самодийских языков. Простое предложение, Ленинград.
Т у ж а р о в Г. 1966, Плюсквамперфект в яранском говоре марийского языка. — СФУ II, 197—199.
Финно-волжская языковая общность, Москва 1989 (= ФВЯО).
Языки народов СССР. Том второй. Тюркские языки, Москва 1966 (= ЯН).

АГО КЮННАП (Тарту)

ОБ АНАЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ФОРМАХ ПРОШЕДШЕГО ВРЕМЕНИ В УРАЛЬСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ

Аналитические формы прошедшего времени в уральских языках имеют западную и восточную модели. В западной группе языков за спрягаемыми формами вспомогательного глагола 'быть' следуют неспрягаемые формы основного глагола, например, эст. *olen lugenud* '(я) читал (давно)', *oled lugenud* '(ты) читал (давно)' и т. д. В восточной группе за спрягаемыми формами основного глагола следуют неспрягаемые формы вспомогательного глагола 'быть', например, мар. *лудам ыле* '(я) читал', *лудат ыле* '(ты) читал' и т. д.

Западная модель напоминает соответствующую модель в германских и балтийских языках, восточная — тюркскую модель в плане следования вспомогательного глагола за основным, но не в плане спрягаемости этих глаголов: в тюркских языках спрягается вспомогательный глагол, а основной стоит в неспрягаемой форме, например, тат. *бара идем* '(я) хаживал', *бара идеӊ* 'ты хаживал' и т. д.

Восточная модель распространяется и на самодийские, в первую очередь северносамодийские языки, как показывают исследования К. Лабанаускаса по категории

времени этих языков; например, нен. *p̃iņβeðamt́s̀* '(я) боялся когда-то', *p̃iņβenaś* '(ты) боялся когда-то', *p̃iņβĩś* '(он) боялся когда-то' и т. д., в которых -*s* представляет собой, по всей вероятности след неспрягаемой формы *V-*śV* вспомогательного глагола 'быть'.

Все это приводит автора статьи к выводу, что нельзя связывать возникновение восточной модели аналитических форм прошедшего времени в уральских языках только со сравнительно поздним влиянием тюркских языков. Лишь в марийском языке, а предположительно и в мордовских, встречается исконно тюркская модель, которая, очевидно, наличествовала уже в пратюркском.