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1. Introduction

• Harakmbut is a language from the Peruvian Amazon, spoken in ‘native communities’ in the departments of Madre de Dios and Cusco

• Genetic affiliation:
  • Formerly classified as an Arawakan or Maipuran language by McQuown (1955) (see Hart 1963: 6) and Matteson (1972); but this has found little acceptance (Adelaar 2007: 39).
  • Wise (1999: 307) states that Harakmbut is commonly accepted to be a (single language) isolate/unclassified language (cf. Fonseca 2002; Vergara 2007; WALS)
  • Adelaar (2000, 2007) proposes that it is genetically related to the Brazilian Katukina family (included in Guaporé-Mamoré linguistic area), which may be further linked to Macro-Ge

• Areality:
  • Some grammatical features are shared with Maipuran Arawak languages, and others with Tacanan languages like Ese Eja (Pozzi-Escot 1998: 93) and Cavineña (Van Linden in prep); the latter are proposed to belong to the Guaporé-Mamoré linguistic area in southwest Brazil and eastern Bolivia, close to the border with Peru (Crevels & van der Voort 2008)
• Harakmbut live in ‘native communities’: patches of land entitled to them by the government
• subtropical climate
• around tributaries of the Madre de Dios River, which eventually flows into the Amazon River;
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1. Introduction

• Dialectal varieties (mutually intelligible): Amarakaeri, Watipaeri, Arasaeri, Pukirieri, Sapiteri, Kisambaeri and Toyoeri

• Previous linguistic work: focus on Amarakaeri dialect (Hart 1963; Helberg 1984, 1990; Tripp 1976ab, 1995)


• Orthographic conventions: <‘>: glottal stop; <¨>: nasal vowel; underlined sounds carry word stress

• today's TOPIC: Two types of constructional effects of non-visual evidential marking

• both types originate in clash in interpretation: use of non-visual marking indicates a shift away from the speaker, while events referred to ('normally') are clearly visible
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2. Harakmbut finite verb form and evidentiality

- Table 1: verbal plural marker (\textit{VPL}) and a set of adverbial prefixes are positionally flexible, entertaining scopal relations with fixed-position prefixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pf1</th>
<th>Pf2</th>
<th>Pf3</th>
<th>Pf4</th>
<th>Pf5</th>
<th>Verb stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mood+agr</td>
<td>BEN (appl)</td>
<td>POSS (appl)</td>
<td>CLF/INCORP.N</td>
<td>SOC (appl)</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>VPL or ≥2 spatial pfs</td>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>spatial pf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The prefix (Pf) string of Harakmbut finite verb forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb stem</th>
<th>Sf1</th>
<th>Sf2</th>
<th>Sf3</th>
<th>Sf4</th>
<th>Sf5</th>
<th>Sf6</th>
<th>Sf7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>Aspl</td>
<td>TRVR</td>
<td>Asp2/AM</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>Asp3</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>mood+agr; mod; evid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>obligatory (but zero exponente possible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Harakmbut finite verb form and evidentiality

Table 1: verbal plural marker (VPL) and a set of adverbial prefixes are positionally flexible, entertaining scopal relations with fixed-position prefixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pf1</th>
<th>Pf2</th>
<th>Pf3</th>
<th>Pf4</th>
<th>Pf5</th>
<th>Verb stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mood+agr</td>
<td>BEN (appl)</td>
<td>POSS (appl)</td>
<td>CLF/INCORP.N</td>
<td>SOC (appl)</td>
<td>obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>VPL or ≥2 spatial pfs</td>
<td>VPL</td>
<td>spatial pf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: The prefix (Pf) string of Harakmbut finite verb forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb stem</th>
<th>Sf1</th>
<th>Sf2</th>
<th>Sf3</th>
<th>Sf4</th>
<th>Sf5</th>
<th>Sf6</th>
<th>Sf7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obligatory</td>
<td>Aspl</td>
<td>TRVR</td>
<td>Asp2/AM</td>
<td>ANA</td>
<td>Asp3</td>
<td>Tense</td>
<td>mood+agr; mod; evid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: The suffix (Sf) string of Harakmbut finite verb forms (cf. Tripp 1976a)
2. Harakmbut finite verb form and evidentiality

- **Experiential** type of evidentiality: indicating whether the speaker witnessed the event denoted by the verb form (VISual) or not (NonVISual)
- restricted to declarative contexts (but see below)

- **Sf7**: EVID in complementary distribution with mood+agreement suffixes and epistemic suffixes:

  (1) \textit{on-a i-ma-ning-to-wa-me-te(-ne) wa-knda ken-tewapa}  
  \hfill 2SG-NOM 2SG-VPL-BEN-SOC-go-REC-NVIS(-IND) NMLZ-egg 3-BEN  
  ‘You (sg) took along eggs for them.’ (speaker did not see it happen)
2. Harakmbut finite verb form and evidentiality

- **Sf6:** tense slot → distinction between (cf. Tripp 1976a, 1995: 221-222; *pace* Helberg 1984: 277):
  - present (zero-marked)
  - future (*-apo*)
  - recent past (*-me*) (cf. (1), (2))
  - distant past tense (*-uy*) (cf. (3))
- **past forms:** obligatorily marked for experiential evidentiality:
  - visual (zero-marked, cf. (2))
  - non-visual (marked by *-(a)te* suffixed to *-me* (1) and *-uy* (3), or by portmanteau *-tuy* (5))

(2)  
\[ \begin{array}{lllll}
  & o’-wa-me-ne & sabado-ta’ & äni-yö & wë-ük-yo \\
 1\text{PL.INCL-go-REC.Vis-Ind} & Saturday(Sp)-LOC & \text{FILLER-LOC} & \text{river-hot-LOC} \\
\end{array} \]

‘We went to this place, eh, Aguas Calientes (‘hot springs’) on Saturday.’ (speaker participated in the action) [spontaneous speech]
2. Harakmbut finite verb form and evidentiality

• **past forms**: obligatorily marked for experiential evidentiality:
  • visual: zero-marked, cf. (2)
  • non-visual: marked by \(-(a)te\) suffixed to \(-me\) (1) and \(-uy\) (3), or by portmanteau \(-tuy\) (4)

(2) \textit{o’-wa-me-ne} \quad \textit{sabado-ta’} \quad \textit{äni-ÿö} \quad \textit{wë-ük-yo}
1PL.INCL-go-REC.VIS-IND \quad Saturday(Sp)-LOC \quad FILLER-LOC \quad liquid-hot-LOC
‘We went to this place, eh, Aguas Calientes (‘hot springs’) on Saturday.’ (speaker participated in the action) [spontaneous speech]

(3) \textit{hak’-udn-ya} \quad \textit{o-ti-kot-uy-ate} \quad \textit{wëÿ-pa’-a}
house-upper.back-LOC \quad 3SG.IND-UP-fall-DIST.PST-NVIS \quad tree-CLF:rod-NOM
‘A branch fell on the roof long ago.’ (speaker did not see it happen)

(4) \textit{O’-wek-tuy} \quad \textit{keme}
3SG.IND-pierce-DIST.PST.NVIS \quad tapir
‘He pierced a tapir (long time ago).’ (speaker did not see it happen)
3. Constructional effect of NVIS: involuntary action

(4) O’-wek-tuy keme
3SG.IND-pierce-DIST.PST.NVIS tapir
‘He pierced a tapir (long time ago).’ (speaker did not see it happen)

(5) Ih-arak-tuy keme
1SG.IND-kill-DIST.PST.NVIS tapir
‘I killed a tapir without realizing it (long time ago).’

• NVIS + 1st person Agent $\rightarrow$ interpretation of involuntary action, cf. (5)
• NVIS marks a shift away from the speaker (Sp has no experiential access)
  $\rightarrow$ clash in interpretation in (5): Sp is signalled not to have witnessed the action, yet Sp is
  presented to have directly participated in the action as an agent, and should therefore have first-
  hand knowledge of it

• cxnal effect described before for a number of (other) Amazonian (e.g. Tariana, Jarawara), Bodic
  (Sino-Tibetan), and Athapaskan languages, and Kolyma Yukaghir (DeLancey 1985; Curnow 2003;
  Maslova 2003; Aikhenvald 2004; see Fauconnier 2012)
3. Constructional effect of NVIS: involuntary action

(5) Ih-arak-tuy keme
    1SG.IND-kill-DIST.PST.NVIS tapir
‘I killed a tapir without realizing it (long time ago).’

- NVIS marks a shift away from the speaker (Sp has no experiential access)
  → clash in interpretation in (5): Sp is signalled not to have witnessed the action, yet Sp is presented to have directly participated in the action as an agent, and should therefore have first-hand knowledge of it

- effect explained in terms of endpoint emphasis by DeLancey (1985): evidential marking that shifts away from the speaker implies that knowledge about the phases leading up to the endpoint of the event is not accessible, in cases like (5) because the Agent is engaged non-voluntarily.

- descriptive validity of Vandelanotte's (2016) proposal:
  → effect of clash between deictic and cognitive perspective?
3. Constructional effect of NVIS: involuntary action

(6)  nong-pa-nda-ning=pi'  o'-ka-te
    other-manner-NDA-SIM=INDET    1PL-do-NVIS
'I think we made a mistake.' (Lit.: We did it the other/wrong way without realizing it)
[spontaneous speech]

• NVIS extremely infrequent in interrogative sentences; yet (7) with 2SG subject:

(7)  menpa    ï’-é’-ate?
    how     2SG-be-NVIS
‘What happened to you?’ (Lit.: How are you (NVIS)?)

(8)  menpa  ï’-é’-Ø?
    how    2SG-be-DUB
‘How are you?’

• Subject in (7)-(8): thematic role of Theme rather than Agent

• NVIS in (7) again leads to an interpretation of **reduced control** on the part of the subject participant
3. Constructional effect of NVIS: involuntary action

(6) nong-pa-nda-ning=pi' o'-ka-te
other-manner-NDA-SIM=INDET 1PL-do-NVIS
'I think we made a mistake.' (Lit.: We did something the other/wrong way without realizing it) [spontaneous speech]

- NVIS extremely infrequent in interrogative sentences; yet (7) with 2SG subject:

(7) menpa ï’-ë’-ate?
how 2SG-be-NVIS
‘What happened to you?’ (Lit.: How are you (NVIS)?)

(8) menpa ï’-ë’-Ø?
how 2SG-be-DUB
‘How are you?’

- Subject in (7)-(8): thematic role of Theme rather than Agent

- NVIS in (7) again leads to an interpretation of reduced control on the part of the subject participant

parallel with egophoricity systems:
cxnal effect only available to cnxs with informant = subject:
in Q, first-hand knowledge resides with H;
with NVIS, Sp anticipates that H may not have full knowledge (esp. of stages leading up to present situation)
3. Constructional effect of NVIS: completion

(9)  o’-sik-ate
    3SG.IND-black-NVIS
    ‘It has become dark.’ Alternatively (post-contact meaning): ‘Good evening!’

- temporal verbs referring to the **cycle of the sun** (often subsumed under meteorological predications, e.g. in Malchukov & Siewierska 2011) sometimes (NOT always) carry non-visual evidential marking

- however, the events referred to are clearly visible to the speaker → why?

- effect explained in terms of **endpoint emphasis** by DeLancey (1985): evidential marking that shifts away from the speaker implies that knowledge about the phases leading up to the endpoint of the event is not accessible, in contrast to knowledge about resultant state
  → emphasis on **completion** of event

(Note that completive aspect marking is also found to signal involuntary action in a number of languages, e.g. Kannada, Bengali, Japanese, Korean, Burmese, cf. Fauconnier 2012, 2013)
3. Constructional effect of NVIS: completion

(9) o’-sik-ate
3SG.IND-black-NVIS
‘It has become dark.’ Alternatively (post-contact meaning): ‘Good evening!’

• effect explained in terms of endpoint emphasis by DeLancey (1985): evidential marking that shifts away from the speaker implies that knowledge about the phases leading up to the endpoint of the event is not accessible, in contrast to knowledge about resultant state
  → emphasis on completion of event

• also completion in terms of discourse/chain of actions:
  • as a castellanisized greeting: a return greeting is expected (also o’sikate), but nothing else
  • as an observation: does not form startingpoint for subsequent action, unlike semantically similar form in –nde:

(10) o’-sik-nde an-mba-kudn hak-yo
3SG.IND-black-ALREADY 2PL.IMP-VPL-enter house-LOC
'It has become dark already; enter (you all) into your house.'
4. Conclusion

• Constructional effects of non-visual evidential marking in Harakmbut:
  • Effect 1: NVIS + 1st person Agent → involuntary action
  • Effect 2: NVIS + impers. pred. → completion

• Origin in clash in interpretation: use of non-visual marking marks a shift away from the speaker, while events referred to ('normally') are clearly visible

• effects explained in terms of endpoint emphasis by DeLancey (1985): evidential marking that shifts away from the speaker implies that knowledge about the phases leading up to the endpoint of the event is not accessible, in contrast to knowledge about resultant state

  • Effect 1: extension of evidentiality to semantic domain of volitionality (event-related) (operates on an egophoric basis; deictic vs. cognitive perspective)
  • Effect 2: extension of evidentiality to the aspectual domain
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