

This was published in *Functions of Language*

Please cite as:

Van linden, An. 2020. Constructional effects of indirect evidential marking in Harakmbut. *Functions of Language* 27(1): 7–28 [Special issue ‘Notes from the field on perspective-indexing constructions: Irregular shifts and perspective persistence’, edited by Stef Spronck, An Van linden, Caroline Gentens and María Sol Sansiñena].

<https://doi.org/10.1075/foL.20004.lin>

Constructional effects of indirect evidential marking in Harakmbut

An Van linden

University of Liège & KU Leuven

Abstract

This article focusses on two types of constructional effects of indirect evidential marking in Harakmbut (isolate, Peru). Both types originate in a clash of interpretation: the use of indirect evidential marking indicates a shift of perspective away from the speaker (as if they did not witness the event, thus disclaiming epistemic authority), while the events referred to are in principle directly accessible to them. As the signalled shift is not fully realized in interpretation, the effects will be characterized as showing perspective persistence. The first type involves constructions with a first person agent, and indirect evidential marking is found to produce the interpretation that the speaker performed the action referred to unintentionally, finding out about the outcome of this action only later. Other types of non-volitional events — without pragmatic inference on the part of the speaker — are found not to carry indirect evidential marking; they use different linguistic means to signal non-volitionality. The second type involves constructions with impersonal predicates referring to the cycle of the sun, and the use of indirect evidential marking yields emphasis on the completion of the event referred to. It is proposed that both types of effects can be explained in terms of endpoint emphasis (cf. DeLancey 1985).

1. The Harakmbut language and collection of data

Harakmbut is an underdescribed language from Amazonian Peru, spoken in a number of ‘native communities’ in the departamentos of Madre de Dios and Cusco. The communities, protected by national law, are located on the Madre de Dios River and its upper tributaries, such as the Colorado and Pukiri Rivers. They border onto the Amarakaeri Communal Reserve, also a protected area, which lies in the centre of the Harakmbut homeland.

The genetic affiliation of Harakmbut is still under discussion. The language has previously been classified as an Arawak or Maipuran language by McQuown (1955) and Matteson (1972), but this has found little acceptance (Adelaar 2007: 39). Wise (1999: 307) maintains that Harakmbut is commonly considered to be an isolate (cf. Dryer & Haspelmath 2013 in WALS). More recently, however, Adelaar (2000, 2007) has reopened the debate. Drawing on primarily lexical evidence, he proposes that Harakmbut is genetically related to the Brazilian Katukinan family, which may be further linked to Macro-Jê. This proposal awaits further corroboration, especially by lexical cognates, as I agree with Queixalós (fc.) that the grammatical evidence in favour of a genetic relationship available so far is thin and unsystematic. Furthermore, language contact should also be taken into account, as Harakmbut displays a number of Western Amazonian grammatical features, as well as features characteristic of the Guaporé-Mamoré linguistic area (Crevels & van der Voort 2008) (see Van linden 2019, fc.).

In addition, the question has been raised whether Harakmbut should be considered a single language with a number of dialectal variants or rather a small language group or family consisting of distinct, related languages. The classification of the Harakmbut into seven ethno-linguistic groups (Amarakaeri,¹ Watipaeri, Arasaeri, Sapiteri, Kisambaeri, Pukirieri and Toyoeri) by the anthropologist Andrew Gray (1996: 7–9) might hint at the latter option, while linguists such as Helberg (1984, 1990), Wise (1999) and Adelaar (2007) have settled on the former. The idea that Harakmbut should be regarded as a single language squares with my language consultants' judgements as well. By now, the most vital varieties are the first two listed above. Of many of the other dialects only a handful of speakers – if any – are left, and very little information is available (see Van linden *fc.*).

Earlier linguistic work on Harakmbut has mainly focussed on the most vital dialect, *i.e.* Amarakaeri/Arakmbut (Hart 1963; Helberg 1984, 1990, 1996; Tripp 1976, 1995). It should be remarked that 'vital' is a relative term, as Moore (2007: 46) estimates the number of speakers at 1,000, and I noticed during my field stays that intergenerational transmission of the language is jeopardized by the fear of social stigma. Children are thus mainly raised in Spanish, and acquire only a passive competence in Harakmbut. Young adults and speakers up to the age of fifty generally are bilingual in Harakmbut and Spanish, while speakers older than fifty are mainly monolingual in Harakmbut. My own fieldwork also concentrates on the Amarakaeri/Arakmbut dialect. The data presented in this paper were collected through audio recording during three field trips in the summers of 2010, 2011 and 2016 (five months in total), in the native communities of Puerto Luz, San José del Karene and Shintuya. So far, I have mainly transcribed and analysed elicitation sessions with bilingual speakers (25 to 40 years old), which implies that a considerable portion of the data used in Sections 2 to 4 does not represent spontaneous speech. If it does, this has been indicated in the example. The practical orthography used is IPA-based, and different from the community spelling.²

This paper focusses on two types of constructional effects of indirect evidential marking in the Amarakaeri/Arakmbut dialect. Both types originate in a clash of interpretation: the use of indirect marking indicates a shift of perspective away from the speaker (as if they did not witness the event), while the events referred to are in principle directly accessible to them. As the shift of perspective is not fully realized in interpretation, that is, it does not apply to all the stages of the event at issue, the effects will be characterized as perspective persistence phenomena (*cf.* Gentens *et al.* 2019; Spronck *et al.*, this issue). In the first type, to be discussed in Section 3, the construction features a first person agent, and the use of indirect evidential marking results in an interpretation of involuntary action. In the second type, to be discussed in Section 4, the construction shows an impersonal predicate referring to the cycle of the sun, and the use of indirect evidential marking yields emphasis on the completion of the event referred to. It will be proposed that both types of effects can be explained in terms of endpoint emphasis as put forward by DeLancey (1985). However, before we home in on these constructional effects of

¹ I would like to point out that the speakers of this variety regard the label *Amarakaeri* as a depreciatory term; it is adapted from *wa-mba-arak-a-eri* (NMZR-VPL-kill-TRNS-AN), a verb-based nominalization meaning '(fierce) killer/murderer' (*cf.* Helberg 1996: 18), which finds its origin in an ancient narrative about the provenance of the different ethno-linguistic groups of the Harakmbut people. They prefer to call their variety 'Arak(m)but', as distinct from the Watipaeri variety, towards whose speakers they generally entertain feelings of enmity rather than brotherhood.

² In the community spelling, nasal quality of vowels is indicated with a diaeresis rather than a tilde, and the glottal stop is represented by an apostrophe rather than the IPA-symbol. In addition, it imposes different spellings for allophonic variants (*e.g.* <ti-> [tʃi] is spelled <chi->, while <to-> remains <to->) as well as for the same allophones in different phonetic conditions (*e.g.* <mb> [mb] is written <mb> post-vocalically, but word-initially and post-consonantly); the practical orthography used here does not adopt such different spellings.

indirect evidential marking, let us take a look at the Harakmbut finite verb form, with a focus on TAME marking (Section 2).

2. The Harakmbut finite verb form and evidentiality

Evidentiality is marked on finite verb forms in Harakmbut, which have the most complex morphological template of all word forms. The template is spread over Tables 1 and 2, presenting the prefixes and suffixes respectively; both tables include the verb stem slot (see Van Linden *fc.*). In Table 1, five prefix slots are fixed, while the verbal plural marker (VPL) and a set of spatial prefixes are positionally flexible, entertaining scope relations with fixed-position prefixes. By contrast, the verbal suffixes (Table 2) do not take part in any configurational strings.

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

Pf1	Pf2	Pf3	Pf4	Pf5	Verb stem
mood+agr	BEN	APPL	CLF/INCORP.N	SOC (appl)	
obligatory					obligatory

Table 2. The suffix (Sf) string of Harakmbut finite verb forms (cf. Tripp 1976)

Verb stem	Sf1	Sf2	Sf3	Sf4	Sf5	Sf6	Sf7
	Asp1	TRNS	Asp2/AM	ANA	Asp3	Tense	mood+agr; mod; evid
obligatory						obligatory (but zero exponence possible)	

As can be seen in Table 2, evidentiality is flagged in the final suffix slot, in which it is in complementary distribution with mood+agreement suffixes and a number of modal suffixes expressing epistemic meanings. In (1), for example, the indirect evidential suffix *-te* precludes the use of the indicative mood suffix *-ne*, which distinguishes between indicative mood (presence of *-ne*) and dubitative mood (absence of *-ne*) for second person singular subjects (acting on third-person object participants). The most important evidential distinction is of the experiential type, indicating whether the speaker witnessed the event denoted by the verb form — that is, experienced it directly through sensory perception, typically visual — (direct) or did not witness it but learned of it after the fact (indirect) (cf. De Haan 2013).

- (1) *on-a* *i-ma-niŋ-to-wa-me-te(*-ne)* *wa-knda* *ken-tewapa*
 2SG-NOM 2SG-VPL-BEN-SOC-go-REC.PST-INDIR.EVD(*-IND) NMZR-egg 3-BEN
 ‘You (sg) took along eggs for them.’ (speaker did not witness it) (cf. Van Linden *fc.*)

In addition to direct and indirect evidential marking, Harakmbut also has an inferential evidential, i.e. *-ta*, which is illustrated in (2).

- (2) *Javier ðʔ-ẽ-tã hak-yo moto o-ta-wadn hak eʔ-ndeaʔ*
 Javier 3SG.IND-be-INFER house-LOC moto 3SG.IND-APPL-sit house NMZR-go.and.face
 ‘Javier must be at home; his motorbike is in front of his house.’

The final slot in the verbal suffix string is preceded by the slot dedicated to tense marking (cf. Table 2). Harakmbut distinguishes between present (zero-marked) (cf. (2)), which is also used with hodiernal past reference, future (-*apo*), recent past (-*me*) (cf. (1), (3)) and distant past tense (-*uy*) (cf. (4)) on finite verb forms (cf. Tripp 1976, 1995: 221–222; *pace* Helberg 1984: 277). As has been noted before (Helberg 1984: 277–279; Tripp 1995: 222), past forms are obligatorily marked for (non-)experiential evidentiality, i.e. direct (zero-marked, cf. (3)) vs. indirect, which is signalled by -(*a*)*te* suffixed to past tense markings -*me* (1) and -*uy* (4), or by the portmanteau marker -*tuy* (5), which fuses tense and evidential categories. Examples (3) to (5) were produced by the same speaker, a woman then in her late twenties brought up and living in Shintuya. In (3), she reports to me on a trip to nearby hot springs we made together a couple of days earlier. The fact that she experienced the event referred to herself is reflected in the use of the indicative mood suffix in the final slot (rather than the indirect evidential marker, used in (1)) (note also the first person inclusive marking on the verb).

- (3) *ken ãnĩ-ỹõ mbaysik o-kyẽ-me-ne*
 then FILLER-LOC dusk 1PL.INCL-arrive.from.trip-REC.PST-IND
 ‘Then, eh, we arrived (back home) at dusk.’ (speaker participated in the action; spontaneous speech)

- (4) *arakmbut õn-mã-ẽn-uy-ate ãnĩ asuk*
 people 3PL.IND-VPL-throw.away-DIST.PST-INDIR.EVD FILLER bark.clothing
 ‘People gave up wearing, eh, bark clothing (long time ago).’ (speaker did not experience this)

The event referred to in (4) took place well before her birth, not so long after the Arakmbut were contacted by Spanish Dominican priests in the 1950s (cf. Gray 1996: 12), so the speaker cannot possibly have witnessed it, which motivates the indirect marking. Lastly, the event referred to in (5) occurred when the speaker was still a child, and her use of -*tuy* indicates that she did not witness it. The subject participants in (5) are about 8 years older than the speaker, and they met when Luis came from Puerto Luz to Shintuya at the age of 12 to attend the missionary boarding school.

- (5) *on-ma-knĩã-tuy Sintuya-yo*
 3PL.IND-VPL-get.to.know.person-DIST.PST.INDIR.EVD Shintuya-LOC
 ‘They (i.e. Maribel and Luis) got to know each other in Shintuya (long time ago).’ (speaker did not experience this)

Finally, in terms of basic clause type, evidential marking seems to be generally restricted to verb forms of declarative sentences. As detailed in Section 3 below, however, indirect evidential marking is not totally excluded in interrogatives, but it has a marked effect in such contexts.

3. Indirect evidential marking with first person agents: involuntary action

The first type of constructional effect of indirect evidential marking in Harakmbut relates to non-volitionality. It will become clear that this effect is restricted to a specific kind of non-volitionality, i.e. involving a pragmatic inference on the part of the speaker, who infers the execution of their own earlier action on the basis of evidence available to them only after the action. Other kinds of non-volitional events or situations – which use non-visual evidentials in other languages – will be shown to use different linguistic marking in Harakmbut.

The constructional effect studied here involves constructions with a first person agent in which the use of indirect evidential marking leads to an interpretation of involuntary action. Consider the contrastive set of examples in (6) and (7).

(6) *oʔ-wek-uy-ate* *keme*
3SG.IND-wound.with.arrow-DIST.PST-INDIR.EVD tapir
'He pierced a tapir (long time ago).'

(7) *ih-arak-tuy* *keme*
1SG.IND-kill-DIST.PST.INDIR.EVD tapir
'I killed a tapir without realizing it (long time ago).'

In (6), which features a third-person agent subject, the indirect evidential suffix marks a shift away from the speaker as source of information, since they are signalled not to have witnessed the action referred to. By contrast, in (7), which has a first person agent subject, the use of indirect evidential marking causes a clash of interpretation, since the speaker is marked as not having witnessed an event they are presented to have directly participated in as an agent, and therefore to have first-hand knowledge of. The resulting interpretation is one of involuntary action, as reflected in the provided translation: the speaker killed the tapir without realizing it; they were not in full control of the event referred to. (Note that in (7) the indirect evidential marker is fused with the distant past tense marker; *-tuy* is also grammatical in (6), instead of *-uy-ate*.)³

Let us also compare (7) to (3) above, which features a first person agent subject as well, but no indirect evidential marking. Example (3) is naturally interpreted as the speaker reporting on her having been voluntarily engaged in the (self-motion) event referred to, having first-hand knowledge thereof. By contrast, example (7), which I collected while eliciting acceptability judgements of construed examples, was explained to me as fitting a context in which the speaker had gone off hunting, had shot arrows in the forest (intentionally), and after having been told that one of these arrows killed a tapir, reports on this event by using an indirect evidential. That is, the speaker was not aware of (the result of) their action while executing it, but draws the conclusion that their earlier action took place on the basis of indirect evidence.

While (7) was collected in an elicitation context, example (8) is taken from a spontaneous conversation between an elderly mother and her adult son, who are trying to arrange the pictures from

³ Note incidentally that the indirect evidential marking does not bear on the morphosyntactic transitivity of the construction in (7), which is 'as transitive as' (6). More generally then, the Harakmbut data provide further confirmation that involuntary agent constructions are not necessarily associated with reduced morphosyntactic transitivity (cf. Fauconnier 2011, 2012).

San Roque *et al.*'s (2012) 'Family problems' task into order. The example involves a kind of non-volitionality similar to that in (7).

- (8) *noj-pa-nda-nij=pi?* *oʔ-ka-te*
 other-manner-NDA⁴-SIM=INDET 1PL-do-INDIR.EVD
 'I think we made a mistake.' (Literally: 'It seems we did something like the other/wrong way without realizing it') [spontaneous speech]

The son is suggesting a particular order for a number of pictures, when — all of a sudden — he utters (8) — which provokes an immediate, uninterpretable interjection-like response from his mother — and he goes on to propose a different ordering of the events depicted. As the interlocutors are deliberately engaged in this task of ordering pictures so that they make a story, the kind of non-volitionality involved in (8) is that of an action that was performed unintentionally, with an undesired outcome, which the speaker becomes aware of only later (by looking at the order of the pictures and seeing a better solution). In both (7) and (8), then, the notion of non-volitionality arises as a pragmatic inference on the part of the speaker, who learns about their execution of a certain action on the basis of evidence available to them at a moment posterior to that action. It should be noted that in Harakmbut zero present tense marking can be used to situate events in the hodiernal past, i.e. before the time of utterance but still on the day the utterance was made, as in (8) above and (9), (21), and (22) below.

Harakmbut is certainly not the only language in which indirect evidential marking in first person agent constructions leads to the interpretation of involuntary action. In fact, this constructional effect of non-visual, non-witnessed or indirect evidential marking has been described before for a number of languages, such as Lhasa Tibetan (Sino-Tibetan, DeLancey 1985), Bagvalal (Nakh-Daghestanian, Tatevosov 2001: 446–447), Tariana (Arawakan, Aikhenvald 2003: 296–297), and Tucano (Tucanoan, Ramirez 1997: 133). Other types of evidential markers have been observed to have similar effects, e.g. the inferential evidential in Kolya Yukaghir (Yukaghir, Maslova 2003). Curnow (2003), Aikhenvald (2004) and Fauconnier (2012: 129–130) provide yet more examples of languages in which non-volitionality is expressed through evidentials. What is shared by all of the constructions concerned — irrespective of the type of evidential marking — is that they are restricted to contexts of past actions performed by the speaker.

These restrictions are crucial to the explanation put forward for this constructional effect of non-visual/non-witnessed/indirect evidential marking, as they ensure that the action referred to is in principle inherently knowable to the speaker. As noted by DeLancey (1985), prototypical agentive actions can be conceived of as implying a causal chain of situations: (i) an act of volition or intention, (ii) realization of the intended action, and (iii) the state resulting from that action. In constructions like (7)–(8), evidential marking coding that the speaker did not witness the event and thus disclaims epistemic authority implies that knowledge about the phases leading up to the endpoint of the event is *not* accessible, and this is because the agent is engaged non-voluntarily. The indirect evidential could thus be taken to apply to stage (i) especially, which the speaker does not “see” or has no direct access to (cf. Curnow 2003: 49). More generally, cases like (7)–(8) reflect the principle of endpoint emphasis

⁴ The analysis of the suffix *-nda* is still unclear. When attached to a case-marked noun or pronoun, it functions as a focus marker (see Van linden *fc.*). In adjective constructions (*noj* is a deictic adjective), by contrast, it does not signal information focus or increased degree (*pace* Tripp 1995: 197). In view of its occurrence on several types of adnominal modifiers and also adverbs, as well as on nominalized verb forms coding the adverbial relation of simultaneity (e.g. [15] in Section 3), its function might be that of producing a general modifier.

underlying involuntary agent constructions (cf. Fauconnier 2011, 2013), which will also be invoked to explain the second constructional effect of indirect evidential marking (Section 4).

Returning to the Harakmbut data, indirect evidential marking is — in addition to actions — also found on *states* with a similar constructional effect, which has not received much attention in the literature so far. The example in (9) is particularly interesting as it constitutes an interrogative sentence with a second-person subject. Compare (9) to (10); the two examples differ minimally in the presence of an indirect evidential; some speakers would add the clitic =*pi?* (used in (8) above) to *menpa* in (9) as well.

(9) *men-pa* *ĩʔ-ẽʔ-ãtẽ?*
 which-manner 2SG-be-INDIR.EVD
 ‘What happened to you?’

(10) *men-pa* *ĩʔ-ẽʔ-Ø?*
 which-manner 2SG-be-DUB
 ‘How are you?’

While (10) serves as a general question querying the addressee’s state of mind or health at the moment of speech, (9) gets a hodiernal past-tense interpretation (cf. (8)) and its subject gets a patientive interpretation, which both point to a change of state reading. Contexts of use of (9) include cases in which it is immediately clear to the speaker that something happened to the addressee that the latter was not voluntarily involved in, e.g. they were stung by insects or suffered from heat stroke. Thus, like in (7) and (8), indirect evidential marking again leads to an interpretation of reduced control on the part of the subject participant. The examples given so far suggest that the constructional effect of indirect evidential marking operates on an egophoric basis (cf. San Roque *et al.* 2018), in that it is only available to constructions in which the subject is charged with epistemic authority. In declarative sentences like (7) and (8), it is the speaker that has authoritative knowledge of the event referred to, while in interrogatives like (9) the speaker concedes authority to the addressee (see Zemp, this issue). In (9), the speaker thus anticipates that the addressee may not have full knowledge of the stages leading up to the present state, which itself is directly accessible to both speaker and addressee; the indirect evidential triggers the inference that the addressee was not voluntarily involved in the stages leading up to the resultant state.

In terms of the kind of non-volitionality, the Harakmbut declarative examples in (7)–(8) are very similar to first-person agent constructions showing an inferential evidential in Kalasha (Indo-Aryan, Bashir 1988: 54) and those with an apparent evidential in Tuyuca (Tucanoan, Barnes 1984: 260), as these also involve an inference on the part of the speaker that an earlier — unintentional — action took place. The same goes for constructions featuring verb forms traditionally labelled as perfects in the Nakh-Daghestanian language Bagvalal, indicated in boldface in (11), which with first person agents produce a “lack of consciousness effect” (Tatevosov 2001: 446). However, while the Harakmbut examples imply the same type of inference as in (11), they are different from (11) in that they do not generally involve agents whose involvement in an event is volitional, but who accidentally target their actions towards the wrong patient (cf. Kittilä 2005).

which has only one argument participant, i.e. the patientive subject *mbaʔegŋ*. Clauses like (12b) are also basically intransitive, but show the — valency-increasing — applicative prefix *ta-*. In (12b), the involuntary agent is coded as a malefactive participant, which the applicative *ta-* promotes to (applied) object status; this results in a portmanteau prefix on the verb indexing both the third person subject *ilo* and the applied object (first person singular). The examples I have collected so far indicate that inadvertent tearing events obligatorily code the involuntary agent and use constructions similar to (12b) (e.g. constructions referring to the getting torn of tents and pants, which contain the verb *-sirat* ‘tear (of fabric)’), while inadvertent breaking events can be coded by structures similar to (12b) or (13b) (e.g. constructions referring to the breaking of arrows, which contain the verb *-ket* ‘break (of solid objects)’).

While unintentional cutting events involve the same kind of non-volitionality as unintentional breaking events, verbs of cutting and breaking have been found to divide universally into two distinct classes, with different kinds of meanings and distinct argument structures (Levin & Rappaport 1995; Majid *et al.* 2008: 237). In Tariana (Arawakan) inadvertent cutting events are coded with non-visual evidentials (Aikhenvald 2003: 297), but in Harakmbut they pattern more similarly to breaking events than to the events in (7)–(8). While volitional events are expressed by transitive clauses (14a), non-volitional events are coded by intransitive clauses whose verb form may incorporate a body-part noun to specify where exactly the agent cut themselves (14b). Like the inadvertent breaking events in (12b) and (13b), (14b) features the non-volitional perfective suffix *-on*. However, (14b) is different from (12b) and (13b) in that the involuntary agent is coded as the subject of the clause, just like the agent of the volitional event in (14a); *-tegŋ* ‘cut’ clearly is no ergative verb like *-sak* ‘break’.

- (14) (a) *ih-mba-tegŋ-me-y* *mbiʔigŋ*
 1SG.IND-VPL-cut-REC.PST-1.IND fish
 ‘I cut the fish (more than one fish) (deliberately).’
- (b) *i-mbaʔ-tegŋ-on-me-y* *siroʔ-a*
 1SG.IND-hand-cut-PFV.NVOL-REC.PST-1.IND machete-INS
 ‘I cut my hand with a machete (accidentally).’

It should be noted that I also found slightly different structures expressing cutting events. Volitional events with *-tegŋ*, for example, also show the transitivizer suffix *-a* added to the verb stem. This suffix has distinct but related functions; it can (i) transitivize intransitive verbs, (ii) function as a (direct) causative marker on intransitive and transitive verbs, and (iii) signal a high degree of intensity of the action on transitive verbs.⁸ It is the latter function that accounts for its possible presence in volitional cutting event structures. Non-volitional events, in turn, may lack the non-volitional perfective suffix if it is clear from the context that the action was unintentional (cf. Van linden 2019: 475, ex. (39)).

Let us turn to events that are unintentional by default, like ‘fall’, ‘trip’ or ‘slip’. In Tucano (Tucanoan), for example, cases like (15) below are marked by the non-visual evidential (Ramirez 1997: 133, as discussed in Curnow 2003: 48). This is not the case in Harakmbut; compare examples (15) to (17), which feature the same verb root *-kot* ‘fall’.

⁸ Hopper & Thompson (1980: 264) mention three other languages in which causatives and intensives use identical coding, i.e. Indonesian, Arabic and Chichewa.

- (15) *e-waʔ-e-a-nda* *ih-kot-me-y*
 NMZR-go-ITER-NOM-NDA 1SG-fall-REC.PST-1.IND
 ‘I fell while I was walking.’ (Literally: ‘I, who was walking, fell’, or ‘I fell walking’) (cf. Van linden 2019: 477, ex. (41))
- (16) *mbe-ku-ti-kot-uy-ne* *apoareʔ-a* *taʔmba-ya*
 3SG>1/2SG-head-SPAT:UP⁹-fall-DIST.PST-IND papaya-NOM swidden-LOC
 ‘A papaya fell on my head in the swidden long ago.’ (cf. Van linden fc.)
- (17) *o-k-mba-kot-onka-me-te* *yave* *An-ta*
 3SG.IND-SEPARATION-VPL-fall-SUDDENLY-REC.PST-INDIR.EVD key An-ACC
 ‘An’s keys fell all of a sudden.’ (Literally: ‘The keys suddenly fell away from An.’)

From these examples we can gather that predicates denoting (by default) inadvertent events like ‘fall’ take direct evidential (zero-)marking when the speaker witnessed the event — and was even involved in it, as subject in (15), or ‘goal’ in (16) — and combine with indirect marking when the speaker did not witness the event, as in (17), which is understood as referring to An dropping her keys unintentionally. Put differently, intransitive predicates having patientive subjects (so-called ‘unaccusative’ verbs, cf. Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995) do not receive indirect evidential marking with first-person subjects, cf. (15), nor do events that affect the speaker, cf. (16).

While (by default) non-volitional events like ‘fall’ are still perceptually observable, this is not the case for psychological/cognitive states like ‘fear’ and bodily states like ‘have fever’. In both Tariana (Arawakan, Aikhenvald 2003: 298–299) and Tucano (Tucanoan, Ramirez 1997: 134, as discussed in Curnow 2003: 44), such states use non-visual evidentials with first-person subjects. The Harakmbut data are again different, in that such cases invariably show direct evidential (zero-)marking, as illustrated in (18a) expressing a psychological state and (18b) expressing a bodily state.

- (18) (a) *ih-mẽ-puk-me-y* (b) *ih-ku-tiri-me-y*
 1SG-(liver-tear)_{fear}-REC.PST-1.IND 1SG-head-ache-REC.PST-1.IND
 ‘I was afraid.’ ‘I had a headache.’

In fact, in contexts like (18a) and (18b) as well as in events like ‘fall’, the difference between Harakmbut on the one hand and Tariana and Tucano on the other has to do with the type of evidentiality system these languages exhibit. While Harakmbut distinguishes between direct, indirect and inferential evidentiality, the other two languages show far more complex systems with two types of direct evidentiality, i.e. visual versus non-visual (Aikhenvald 2003: 294; Ramirez 1997: 129). That is, for non-volitional events like ‘fall’, psychological/cognitive states like ‘fear’ and bodily states like ‘have fever’ the three languages all use (a type of) direct evidential marking with first person subjects. Psychological/cognitive states and bodily states with third person subjects can but need not take indirect evidential marking in Harakmbut, cf. (19) and (20).

⁹ The spatial prefix *ti-* indicates location high up; here it refers to the falling movement of the papaya from high up onto the speaker’s head.

- (19) *An o-mẽ-puk-me petpet-ta*
 An 3SG.IND-(liver-tear)_{fear}-REC.PST jaguar-ACC
 ‘An was afraid of the jaguar.’
- (20) *sũwĩt-ta on-tiaway-po on-mẽ-puk-on-tuy*
 humming.bird-ACC 3PL.IND-see-DEP 3PL.IND-(liver-tear)_{fear}-PFV.NVOL-DIST.PST.INDIR.EVD
petpet-ta
 jaguar-ACC
 ‘When they saw the humming bird, they began to fear the jaguar (long time ago).’

While (20) refers to a passage from a narrative transmitted orally from one generation to another, (19) refers to a situation that occurred in a community different from the speaker’s (and from the place of recording). It should thus be noted that the speaker in (19) certainly did not have first-hand knowledge of this situation, but yet did not use indirect evidential marking. However, both (19) and (20) were elicited in translation sessions, so we need to be careful here. What is also interesting to note is that the perfective suffix in (20), which forces a change-of-state interpretation onto the stative predicate ‘fear’, is the non-volitional paradigmatic variant *-on*.

In conclusion, the Harakmbut data thus indicate that indirect evidential marking produces the interpretation that a first person agent performed an action unintentionally, whose outcome this agent becomes aware of only later. Situations in which non-volitionality does not arise as a pragmatic inference from the speaker (having to infer their own earlier action) do not use indirect evidential marking. The discussion above showed that Harakmbut shows a far more restricted use of evidential marking with first person subjects in non-volitional contexts than other Amazonian languages like Tariana and Tucano. In these languages the interpretation of involuntary action is observed with a type of direct evidential, i.e. non-visual, in inadvertent breaking and cutting events, ‘default’ non-volitional events like ‘fall’, psychological/cognitive states and bodily states.

4. Indirect evidential marking with impersonal predicates: completion

The second type of constructional effect has – to my knowledge – not been discussed before. It is different from the first one in that it arises in constructions that do not involve the speaker as an argument participant. More specifically, indirect evidential marking is found on events that do not have any participant at all, i.e. impersonal predicates referring to the cycle of the sun, which are subsumed under meteorological predications in the papers in Malchukov & Siewierska (2011). Such temporal verbs denote events that are clearly visible to the speaker; yet they often – but not obligatorily, see (24) below – carry indirect evidential marking. Examples are given in (21)–(22), which are zero-marked for present tense. Like in (8) and (9) above, they receive a hodiernal past reading.

- (21) *oʔ-sik-ate*
 3SG.IND-black-INDIR.EVD
 ‘It has become dark.’

- (22) *oʔ-me-ate*
 3SG.IND-dawn-INDIR.EVD
 ‘The day has broken.’

The language consultants I worked with told me that the verb forms in (21) and (22) came to be used as greetings after contact with Spanish Dominican missionaries in the 1950s (cf. Gray 1996: 12), with (21) corresponding to Spanish *buenas noches* ‘good evening’ and (22) to *buenos días* ‘good morning’. However, these greetings are not frequently used in the communities I collected data. The traditional way of greeting in Harakmbut uses verb forms that refer to the action of the speaker or addressee, e.g. (23), used in contexts of leave-taking.

- (23) *ih-wa-y*
1SG-go-1.IND
‘I go.’ (functionally equivalent to ‘goodbye’)

I propose that this second type of constructional effect also originates in a clash of interpretation: again, the use of indirect evidential marking indicates a shift of perspective away from the speaker (with the speaker disclaiming epistemic authority signalling they did not witness the event), while the events referred to are in principle available to everyone present.¹⁰ This second effect thus also instantiates perspective persistence: the shift of perspective is not fully realized in interpretation (cf. Gentens *et al.* 2019: 159; Spronck *et al.*, this issue), as it does not apply to all the phases of the event talked about. This is why this second type of effect can equally well be explained in terms of endpoint emphasis: like in cases with first person agents such as (7)–(8), the indirect evidential marking implies that knowledge about the phases leading up to the endpoint of the event is not accessible, in contrast to knowledge about the resultant state. The speaker may not have witnessed the process of it becoming dark, or of the sun rising, but has access to the resultant states of these events. The evidential marking thus highlights the completion of the event; its function verges on that of a completive aspect marker. The latter term is used here in the sense of Bybee *et al.* (1994: 57): it emphasizes that the action represented by the verb was carried out to completion. This is rendered by the use of present perfect tense forms in the English translations of the Harakmbut present-tense forms in (21)–(22). My language consultants translated the forms with an indefinite past tense in Spanish.

The affinity between non-witnessed evidential marking and completive aspect/perfect markers is also evidenced in other languages. In the Caucasian languages Georgian (Kartvelian, Hewitt 1995: 259) and Bagvalal (Nakh-Daghestanian, Tatevosov 2001: 446–447), for example, verb forms analysed as perfects often receive a non-witnessed or inferential evidential interpretation (cf. Curnow 2003: 40–42). There is also a link between completive aspect marking and non-volitionality. Fauconnier (2012: 78–83; 2013) shows that in languages from four different families (Japanese-Korean, Dravidian, Indo-European and Sino-Tibetan) involuntary agent constructions can use a completive marker. Fauconnier’s (2013: 35) semantic account is similar to that proposed for the use of indirect evidential marking to code non-volitional events: like indirect evidentials, completive markers can be used to yield emphasis on the completion of an action as unexpected and unanticipated.

Finally, on a more speculative note, indirect evidential marking on verbs referring to the cycle of the sun in Harakmbut also seems to signal completion in terms of discursive interaction and chains of

¹⁰ The reason for disclaiming epistemic authority here is different from that for the first effect of indirect evidential marking discussed in Section 3, as here the speaker is not involved as an agent. As suggested by an anonymous referee, the speaker’s disclaim here arises from the fact that the observed event is not exclusively accessible to the speaker, but also to the interlocutor.

actions. When used as ‘hispanicized’ greetings, confirmation – typically taking the form of a return greeting featuring the same expressions as in (21)–(22) – is expected, but nothing else. When used in their original meaning, expressing the speaker’s observation on the position of the sun, examples (21)–(22) do not demand any type of response. Importantly, such literal uses are not followed by a call for action by the speaker either. If the speaker wants to draw the interlocutor’s attention to the position of the sun to justify an ensuing directive speech act, they resort to a different verb form, featuring the suffix *-nde*, which expresses the temporal adverbial meaning ‘already’ (cf. Van linden *fc.*), as illustrated in (24).

- (24) *oʔ-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 houses.’

5. Conclusion

This paper has focussed on two constructional effects of indirect evidential marking in Harakmbut, more specifically the Amarakaeri/Arakmbut variety. Both involve an apparent mismatch between meaning and form; they use marking that indicates a shift of perspective away from the speaker, but this shift is not fully realized in the interpretation. The first effect involves constructions with first person agents, and indirect evidential marking is found to produce the interpretation that the speaker(s) performed the action referred to unintentionally, finding out about the result of this action only later on. The second effect involves constructions with impersonal predicates referring to the cycle of the sun, and the use of indirect evidential marking emphasizes the completion of the event referred to. Both types thus originate in a clash of interpretation: the use of indirect marking indicates a shift of perspective away from the speaker (with the speaker disclaiming epistemic authority), while the events referred to are in principle directly accessible to them. With the signalled shift of perspective not fully realized in interpretation (as it does not apply to all the phases of the event at issue) and with the concomitant addition of speaker-related meanings such as non-volitionality (on the part of the speaker only) and completion emphasis, the effects have been characterized as showing perspective persistence (cf. Gentens *et al.* 2019: 159; Spronck *et al.*, this issue).

While the first effect has been described for other languages before (e.g. Aikhenvald 2004; Curnow 2003), the second effect is thought to be new, but at the same time not very surprising in view of, for instance, data from Caucasian languages. While the Harakmbut data indicate that the category of evidentiality may extend into the aspectual domain – with indirect evidential marking expressing completive aspect – Caucasian languages like Georgian (Kartvelian, Hewitt 1995: 259) and Bagvalal (Nakh-Daghestanian, Tatevosov 2001: 446–447) show the opposite direction of semantic extension of grammatical categories, with verb forms analysed as perfects often receiving a non-witnessed or inferential evidential interpretation (cf. Curnow 2003: 40–42). In addition, it proved possible to identify a single principle that underlies the use of indirect evidential marking in both effects, which is that of endpoint emphasis, invoked by DeLancey (1985) to explain the use of indirect evidentials in involuntary agent constructions (see Section 3). Fauconnier (2012, 2013) invoked the same principle to account for completive aspect marking in involuntary agent constructions, and the Harakmbut data suggested that it also motivates the use of indirect evidentials on impersonal constructions referring to the cycle of the sun (Section 4).

In examining the scope of the first constructional effect of indirect evidential marking in Harakmbut, in which the category of evidentiality is seen to extend into the domain of event semantics in general and of volitionality in particular, it was found that it applies to non-volitional actions as well as states, but only in cases where there is a pragmatic inference on the part of the speaker (or rather, the participant that has epistemic authority), which necessarily implies a time interval between the event referred to and the speaker's awareness of its resultant state. Interestingly, non-volitional actions or states in which there is no such pragmatic inference do not feature indirect evidential marking in Harakmbut. Other Amazonian languages such as Tariana (Aikhenvald 2003: 296–297) and Tucano (Tucanoan, Ramirez 1997: 133–134), for which the same constructional effect of an interpretation of involuntary action has been noted with non-visual evidential marking, do extend this non-visual evidential marking to far more non-volitional contexts, such as inadvertent cutting and breaking events, perceptually observable events that are non-volitional by default (e.g. 'fall'), as well as non-observable psychological/cognitive states like 'fear' and bodily states like 'have fever'. It should be kept in mind, though, that in these languages non-visual evidential marking is still of the direct evidential type (in the sense of De Haan (2013)), as it signals that knowledge is accessible through the senses other than sight. As the situations discussed in this paper do not exhaust all possible kinds of non-volitional events or states, future research could aim for a more comprehensive study of non-volitionality in Harakmbut, covering also, for instance, involuntary bodily activities like 'snore' or involuntary bodily processes like 'cough'. The analysis could also focus more on the speaker's appraisal of the outcome of unintentional actions, as desirable or undesirable. Such a study is expected to enhance our current understanding of event semantics and non-volitionality more generally.

A final question raised by this study pertains to the link between involuntary agent constructions and egophoric patterning, discussed in Section 3. Is this link cross-linguistically recurrent, and can additional instantiations be motivated by the principle of endpoint emphasis as well (see Zemp, this issue)? Further research might also point to function-form mismatches in other areas of grammar that also operate on an egophoric basis.

Acknowledgements

The research reported on has been made possible by mobility grants and postdoctoral grants from the Research Foundations FWO and FNRS, as well as by research project grants from the research council of KU Leuven (GOA/12/007 & C14/18/034). I thank the anonymous reviewers and my co-editors for their insightful comments on earlier drafts. Any errors of fact or interpretation remain my own responsibility. Finally, my sincere thanks go to the Harakmbut people, who warmly welcomed me in their communities and patiently taught me their beautiful language.

References

- Adelaar, Willem F.H. 2000. Propuesta de un nuevo vínculo genético entre dos grupos lingüísticos indígenas de la Amazonía occidental: Harakmbut y Katukina. In Luis Miranda Esquerre (ed.), *Actas del I Congreso de Lenguas Indígenas de Sudamérica*, L. Miranda Esquerre (ed.), vol. 2, 219–236. Lima: U. Ricardo Palma.
- Adelaar, Willem F.H. 2007. Ensayo de clasificación del katawixí dentro del conjunto harakmbut-katukina. In Andres Romero-Figueroa, Ana Fernández Garay, Ángel Corbera Mori (eds.), *Lenguas indígenas de América del Sur*, 159–169. Caracas: Universidad Católica Andrés Bello.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2003. *A grammar of Tariana*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barnes, Janet. 1984. Evidentials in the Tuyuca verb. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 50(3). 255–271.
- Bashir, Elena. 1988. Inferentiality in Kalasha and Khowar. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 24(1). 47–59.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins & William Pagliuca. 1994. *The evolution of grammar. Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Crevels, Mily & Hein van der Voort. 2008. The Guaporé-Mamoré region as a linguistic area. In Pieter Muysken (ed.), *From linguistic areas to areal linguistics*, 151–179. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Curnow, Timothy J. 2003. Nonvolitionality expressed through evidentials. *Studies in Language* 27(1). 39–59.
- DeLancey, Scott. 1985. Lhasa Tibetan evidentials and the semantics of causation. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 1. 65–72.
- De Haan, Ferdinand. 2013. Semantic Distinctions of Evidentiality. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *WALS Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Dryer, Matthew S. & Haspelmath, Martin (eds.) 2013. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.
- Epps, Patience & Lev Michael (eds). Forthcoming. *Amazonian Languages, An International Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Fauconnier, Stefanie. 2011. Involuntary agent constructions are not directly linked to reduced transitivity. *Studies in Language* 35(2). 311–336.
- Fauconnier, Stefanie. 2012. *Constructional effects of involuntary and inanimate Agents: A cross-linguistic study*. Leuven: University of Leuven PhD thesis.
- Fauconnier, Stefanie. 2013. Completives as markers of non-volitionality. *Folia Linguistica* 47 (1). 35–54.
- Gentens, Caroline, María Sol Sansiñena, Stef Spronck & An Van linden. 2019. Introduction to Irregular Perspective Shifts and Perspective Persistence, Discourse-Oriented and Theoretical Approaches, in Special Issue edited by Caroline Gentens, María Sol Sansiñena, Stef Spronck & An Van linden. *Pragmatics* 29 (2). 155–169. [<https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.18050.gen>]
- Gray, Andrew. 1996. *The Arakmbut: Mythology, Spirituality and History*. Oxford: Berghahn.
- Haller, Felix. 2000. Verbal categories of Shigatse Tibetan and Themchen Tibetan. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 23 (3). 175–191.
- Hart, Raymond. 1963. Semantic components of shape in Amarakaeri Grammar. *Anthropological Linguistics* 5 (9). 1–7.
- Helberg Chávez, Heinrich Albert. 1984. *Skizze einer Grammatik des Amarakaeri*. Tübingen: Tübingen University PhD thesis.
- Helberg Chávez, Heinrich Albert. 1990. Análisis funcional del verbo amarakaeri. In Rodolfo Cerrón Palomino & Gustavo Solís Fonseca (eds.), *Temas de lingüística amerindia*, 227–249. Lima: Concytec.
- Helberg Chávez, Heinrich Albert. 1996. *Mbaisik: en la penumbra del atardecer. Literatura oral del Pueblo Harakmbut*. Lima: Centro Amazónico de la Antropología y Aplicación Práctica.
- Hewitt, B. George. 1995. *Georgian: A structural reference grammar* [London Oriental and African Language Library 2]. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Hopper, Paul & Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56 (2). 251–299.

- Kittilä, Seppo. 2005. Remarks on involuntary agent constructions. *Word* 56(3). 381–419.
- Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the syntax-lexical semantics interface*. Cambridge, MA: MIT press.
- Majid, Asifa, James S. Boster & Melissa Bowerman. 2008. The cross-linguistic categorization of everyday events: A study of cutting and breaking. *Cognition* 109. 235–250.
- Malchukov, Andrej & Anna Siewierska (eds.). 2011. *Impersonal Constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Maslova, Elena. 2003. *A grammar of Kolyma Yukaghir*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Matteson, Esther. 1972. Proto Arawakan. In Esther Matteson, Alva Wheeler, Frances L. Jackson, Nathan E. Waltz & Diana R. Christian (eds.), *Comparative studies in Amerindian languages*, 160–242. The Hague: Mouton.
- McQuown, Norman A. 1955. Indigenous Languages of Latin America. *American Anthropologist* 57. 501–570.
- Moore, Denny. 2007. Endangered languages of lowland tropical South America. In Matthias Brenzinger (ed.), *Language diversity endangered*, 29–58. The Hague: Mouton.
- Queixalós, Francesc. Forthcoming. Katukinan. In Patience Epps & Lev Michael (eds.).
- Ramirez, Henri. 1997. *A fala Tukano dos Ye'pâ-Masa*, vol. 1: *Gramática*. Manaus: Inspeção Salesiana Missionária da Amazônia & Centro “Iauareté” de Documentação Etnográfica e Missionária.
- San Roque, Lila, Alan Rumsey, Lauren Gawne, Stef Spronck, Darja Hoenigman, Alice Carroll, Julia Colleen Miller & Nicholas Evans. 2012. Getting the Story Straight: Language Fieldwork Using a Narrative Problem-Solving Task. *Language Documentation & Conservation* 6. 135–174.
- San Roque, Lila, Simeon Floyd & Elisabeth Norcliffe (eds.). 2018. *Egophoricity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Spronck, Stef, An Van linden, Caroline Gentens & María Sol Sansiñena. This issue. Perspective persistence and irregular perspective shift: mismatches in form-function pairings.
- Tatevosov, Sergei. 2001. From resultatives to evidentials: Multiple uses of the perfect in Nakh-Daghestanian languages. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(3). 443–464.
- Tripp, Robert. 1976. Los verbos Amarakaeri. *Datos Etno-Lingüísticos: Colección de los archivos del ILV* 33. Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- Tripp, Robert. 1995. *Diccionario amarakaeri-castellano*. Yarinacocha: Min. de Educación & SIL.
- Van linden, An. Forthcoming. Harakmbut. In Patience Epps & Lev Michael (eds.).
- Van linden, An. 2019. Nominalization in Harakmbut. In Roberto Zariquiey, Masayoshi Shibatani & David W. Fleck (eds.), *Nominalization in Languages of the Americas*, 455–490. Amsterdam: Benjamins. [<https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.124.12lin>]
- Wise, Mary R. 1999. Small language families and isolates in Peru. In Robert M.W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *The Amazonian languages*, 307–340. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zemp, Marius. This issue. Evidentials and their pivot in languages on and around the Tibetan plateau.

Abbreviations

1	1st person	ACC	accusative
2	2nd person	AM	associated motion
3	3rd person	AN	animate
>	acting on	ANA	action narrowly averted

APPL	applicative	ITER	iterative
AUX	auxiliary	LOC	locative
BEN	beneficiary/benefactive	N	class marker
CLF	classifier	NMZR	nominalizer
CONV	converb	NOM	nominative
DEP	dependent verb form	NVOL	non-volitional
DIST.PST	distant past	PFV	perfective
DUB	dubitative	PL	plural
ERG	ergative	PRS	present
IMP	imperative	REC.PST	recent past
INCL	inclusive	SG	singular
INCORP.N	incorporated noun	SIM	similative
IND	indicative	SOC	sociative causative
INDIR.EVD	indirect evidential	SPAT	spatial
INDET	indeterminate	TRNS	transitiviser
INFER	inferential evidential	VOL	volitional
INS	instrumental	VPL	verbal plural