Non-witnessed evidentiality in Tupará and its connection to resultative constructions in the perfect aspect

Accepted for publication in the International Journal of American Linguistics.

Adam Roth Singerman
University of Chicago
adamsingerman@uchicago.edu

Abstract

Tupán languages typically mark evidentiality through freestanding particles located in a predicate- or clause-peripheral position. In Tupará, however, non-witnessed evidentiality is realized by a bound verbal suffix (-pné/-psira). This article draws upon original fieldwork to offer a detailed description and analysis of -pné/-psira. I argue that using -pné/-psira presupposes commitment to the proposition p on the part of the speaker. This analysis explains the incompatibility between -pné/-psira and clause-typing particles that signal doubt or uncertainty; furthermore, it accounts for how the witnessed/non-witnessed contrast projects out of embedded clauses. This article also puts forth an explanation for the historical origin of -pné/-psira. A separate suffix, resultative -psé/-pné/-psira, is partially homophonous with the evidential but differs from it on several diagnostics. I propose that resultative constructions in the perfect aspect (‘the snake is in the state of having died’) were reinterpreted as non-firsthand statements in the past tense (‘the snake died [NON-WITNESSED]’).¹
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Lowland South American languages possess some of the most elaborate systems of grammaticalized evidentiality in the world. Particularly famous cases come from northwest Amazonia, where the elaborate systems of the Eastern Tukanoan languages (Barnes 1984, 1999; Stenzel 2008; Stenzel and Gómez-Imbert 2018) and of their non-Tukanoan neighbors (Aikhenvald 2003; Epps 2005) are found. Complex evidential systems occur in other lowland South American families, as well, including Panoan (Valenzuela 2003; Fleck 2007; Munro et al. 2012) and Nambikwaran (Kroeker 2001; Telles and Wetzels 2006; Eberhard 2012, 2018). Evidentiality in many Tupían languages, meanwhile, remains little described, even though Tupían is one of South America’s largest families both in terms of geographic dispersion and sheer number of languages (Urban 1996; Vender Velden 2010; Rodrigues and Cabral 2012; Eriksen and Galucio 2014). Those Tupían varieties which do possess grammaticalized evidentiality typically mark the category via free rather than bound morphology – see, for example, Seki (2000) on Kamaiurá, Tonhauser (2014) and Velázquez-Catillo (2017) on Paraguayan Guaraní, and Gabas Jr. (1999) on Karo. Outside of the large Tupi-Guaraní branch, the most detailed study of evidentiality in a Tupían language that I know of is Chaves Alexandre (2017), a masters thesis on Karitiana which builds on the empirical foundation provided by Storto (1999, 2001).

The goal of this article is to contribute to our understanding of evidentiality in the Tupían family by examining how this category is realized in Tuperí [ISO: tpr], an endangered language spoken in the Brazilian state of Rondônia by approximately 350 people. Tuperí marks evidentiality via the bound verbal suffix -pnê/-psira, which occupies a fixed position inside of tense morphology and which agrees in number with the subject. In this respect the language diverges strikingly from the broader Tupían strategy of using clause- or predicate-peripheral evidential particles.

I advance the following claims in this article. First, the suffix -pnê/-psira sits immediately inside of tense morphology in the Tuperí predicate. Translating into the syntax, the projection headed by -pnê/-psira – the Evidential Phrase – occupies a position above positional and aspectual auxiliaries but below the Tense Phrase. Second, the witnessed/non-witnessed distinction must be made in all past tense declarative clauses. Outside of declaratives the availability of -pnê/-psira depends on clause type: the witnessed/non-witnessed distinction is neutralized by clause-typing particles that express doubt, uncertainty, or ignorance. The incompatibility between the evidential distinction and this specific subset of clause-typing particles arises because using -pnê/-psira presupposes the speaker’s commitment to the proposition p. Finally, evidential -pnê/-psira is partially homophonous with the resultative suffix -psê/-pnê/-psira. Resultative -psê/-pnê/-psira is a non-obligatory morpheme which shows sensitivity to lexical aspect, encodes a positional contrast with singular subjects, and occupies a low syntactic position. I argue that it served as the historical source for -pnê/-psira, which resides in the clause’s inflectional layer. Diachronically, resultative constructions in the perfect aspect (‘the snake is in the state of having died’) were reinterpreted as
non-firsthand statements in the past tense (‘the snake died [NON-WITNESSED’]).

This article is organized as follows. Section 1 provides background on the study of evidentiality and Section 2 summarizes what has been said about evidentiality in previous descriptive work on Tuparí. Section 3 then describes the morphophonological properties of -\textit{pnê/-psira} and the position of this suffix within the language’s clause structure. Section 4 describes and analyzes how -\textit{pnê/-psira} interacts with set of second position clause-typing particles. Section 5 details the behavior of the witnessed/non-witnessed distinction in finite embedded clauses and argues that -\textit{pnê/-psira} is licit only when the speaker’s commitment to the proposition \( p \) is presupposed. The historical origins of Tuparí evidentiality are addressed in Section 6, which argues that -\textit{pnê/-psira} developed out of resultative -\textit{psê/-pnê/-psira}. Section 7 concludes. The online appendix addresses the interpretive effects of combining -\textit{pnê/-psira} with first person subjects and with negative morphology.

All of the data discussed in this paper were collected by me over the course of ten months of on-site fieldwork in the Brazilian state of Rondônia. A major source of these data are the stories included in \textit{Wan Tupari Ema’en Nika!} (Tupari et al. 2016), a literacy workbook which I co-edited together with three indigenous schoolteachers: Geovane Kamarom Tupari, Isaias Tarimâ Tupari and Raul Pat’awre Tupari. I have also made use of several texts collected since that workbook was completed and of my corpus of excerpts from everyday conversation. Elicitation has been used to test the grammatical well-formedness and pragmatic felicity of the conversational data. Non-elicited examples from texts and conversation are prioritized throughout this paper as part of a broader attempt to create a documentary record for Tuparí that is both culturally informed and culturally informative (see Mithun 2001 and Hill 2006:613–614 for useful discussion). Because of the deictic nature of evidential marking, I provide explicit discourse contexts for many examples.

1 Background on evidentiality
This article follows much typological and formal work by defining evidentiality as the grammaticalized marking of the source of information that the speaker has for making a statement (see Jakobson 1957/1971; Chafe and Nichols 1986; Willett 1988; Aikhenvald 2004, 2018; Brugman and Macaulay 2015; Murray 2017, among others). As those authors note (see especially the recent work by Aikhenvald and by Brugman and Macaulay), this definition includes two key components. First, evidentiality proper has as its semantic core the notion of source of evidence. While morphemes that meet this criterion may also contribute other kinds of meaning – such as aspect, tense, epistemic confidence, or some combination of these – only those that primarily indicate source of evidence can be considered evidentials. Second, evidentiality proper is taken to be grammatical rather than lexical; it is canonically expressed via bound morphology rather than as a freestanding adverbial. Hence optional elements like the English adverbs ‘allegedly’ or ‘reportedly’ are not
considered grammatical evidentials *sensu stricto*.

Disentangling epistemic modals and evidentials from one another constitutes a major descriptive and analytic challenge for many languages (see Matthewson 2012 and references therein). In Tupará such disentangling is not difficult to accomplish, as the sole function of -pne/-psira is to mark whether a past tense occurrence was witnessed or not. The speaker’s attitude or epistemic stance, meanwhile, is expressed via the set of second position clause-typing particles. These particles separate certain speech acts from one another and can also indicate the degree of commitment that the speaker has to the proposition \( p \): nākop ‘maybe’ signals little to no commitment to \( p \), pa’a/ta’a ‘assertive’ highlights the speaker’s confidence in \( p \), and so on. As shown in Section 4, these particles form a single closed class and are located in a much higher syntactic position than the one occupied by -pne/-psira. In short, the clausal organization of Tupará cleanly separates epistemic and evidential markers from one another; -pne/-psira is the only morpheme whose main function is to mark source of evidence.

2 Prior descriptions of evidentiality in Tupará

In the earliest descriptive work on the Tupará language, Caspar and Rodrigues (1957:§3.3.4.3.4) identify a suffix, =na, whose meaning they describe as follows:2 “With the suffix =na the null-stem constructs a form that expresses the past in general, but its more exact meaning is perhaps permansiv, that is, it means that the subject or object always finds itself in a completed state…” Caspar and Rodrigues offer several sentences that include this suffix, but their translations do not include any indication of non-witnessed semantics.

Alves (2004:§4.3.2.2) correctly identifies the basic meaning of the evidential morpheme: “The evidential suffix is used in those situations where the speaker did not witness the event.” She also recognizes that the evidential morpheme contains an initial labial, contrasting the allomorphs na, pna and mna against one other. However, her analysis does not disentangle the singular evidential suffix from the theme vowel -a, and it omits the plural form.

Seki (2001) includes several examples where the singular evidential suffix is present. The suffix is glossed as AUX in these examples and the translations do not indicate the non-witnessed interpretation. Seki also gives one example where the evidential is treated as part of the verbal root itself: Ameko-t kur-et ēropna ‘The jaguar killed the boy’. Complete segmentation of the verbal word in this example would involve three distinct morphemes:3

---

2Thank you to Andrew Malilay White for assistance with the German. For the examples cited in this section from Caspar and Rodrigues (1957), Seki (2001) and Alves (2004), I follow the authors’ original orthographic choices. The translations from Portuguese are my own, as is the highlighting of specific morphemes.

3All examples are given in a four-line format. The first line shows the standard orthography approved by the indigenous schoolteachers and utilized in Tupari et al. (2016). The second line gives a morpheme-by-morpheme breakdown; the underlying vowels that are deleted on the surface by the theme vowel -a and related affixes are in-
(1) Amêkot kuret őpopnã.
  amêko-t kut-et őpo-pnê-a
  jaguar-NUC child-NUC kill-EVID:SG-TH
  ‘The jaguar killed the boy (NON-WITNESSED).’ (from Seki 2001:305)

I do not know of any other mention in the literature of evidential marking in Tuparí.

3 Basic morphophonology and morphosyntax of -pnê/-psira
The evidential suffix in Tuparí agrees with the subject in number. Both the singular and plural evidentials have several phonologically conditioned allomorphs. The allomorphy shown in this table follows straightforwardly from two general processes at work in Tuparí phonology (Singerman 2016, 2018a). First, oral consonants nasalize in coda position following nasal vowels. Second, C₁C₂C₃ sequences are simplified to C₁C₃, with the two surviving consonants syllabified into different syllables.

(2) Two phonological processes affecting the realization of the evidential
a. Nasalization of oral coda consonants:

b. Consonant cluster simplification:
   C₁C₂C₃ → C₁C₃

Table 1: Allomorphy of the singular and plural evidential suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>After an oral vowel</th>
<th>After a nasal vowel</th>
<th>After a consonant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SINGULAR</td>
<td>-pnê</td>
<td>-mnê</td>
<td>-nê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLURAL</td>
<td>-psira</td>
<td>-msira</td>
<td>-sira</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

clued. Morpheme-by-morpheme glosses generally do not indicate null morphemes, though the third person proclitics and the third person enclitics have null allomorphs. These are marked with ∅. The letter y represents a palatal glide. This glide is nasalized when adjacent to a nasal vowel; in coda position following an oral vowel, it is realized as [c’]. The apostrophe marks glottal stops; grave accents mark long vowels.

Abbreviations used in glosses: f = female speech only, m = male speech only, 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = disjoint third person, 3C = coreferent third person, ADV.FOC = adverbial focus, AUX = auxiliary, AUXtrip = member of the auxiliary series related to the lexical verb ‘go’, AUXhabit = temporally unspecified habitual auxiliary, AUXpresent = present habitual auxiliary, COM = comitative-causative, DUR = durative, EVID = evidential, EXCL = exclusive, HZNTL = horizontal, INCL = inclusive, INS = instrumental-lative case, LOC = locative case, NEG = negation, NMZ = nominalizer, NUC = nuclear case (obligatory on all NP subjects), OBL = oblique case, PAUC = paucal, PL = plural, PROG = progressive, PURP = purposive subordinator, RSLT = resultative, SG = singular, TH = theme vowel, VBLZ = verbalizer, VRTCL = vertical. Additional abbreviations: AgrSP = subject agreement phrase, C = consonant, CP = Complementizer Phrase, EvidP = Evidential Phrase, NP = Noun Phrase, TP = Tense Phrase, V = vowel, VP = Verb Phrase, vP = phrase that introduces the external argument, wh = formal feature that defines content interrogatives, XP = syntactic phrase of any category. Per IJAL glossing practices, a colon is used with portmanteau morphs (i.e., EVID:SG is the gloss for singular evidential -pnê).
Applied together, these two processes correctly predict that the initial labial of the singular and plural evidential suffixes will be realized as [p] after oral vowels and as [m] after nasal vowels but will be deleted altogether after consonants. Various other suffixes follow the exact same pattern, including possessive -psiro/-msiro/-siro and resultative -ps/-pn/-psira.

The suffix -pn/-psira occupies a fixed position in the Tupará clause: it attaches to the highest verbal head. This verbal head will be the lexical verb itself in clauses that lack an auxiliary.

(3) Evidential -pn/-psira attaches to the highest verbal head

a. Easat mâkêrô te’usi patnan?
e-asa-t mâkêrô te-a’usi pat-nê-a-n
2SG-old.brother-NUC confirmative 3C-wife marry-EVID:SG-TH-NEAR.PAST
‘Your older brother got married, right (NON-WITNESSED)’?
casual discourse: 2017-08-04

b. Pot’at tearopkà teakapsirat.
pot’a-t te-arop-ko-a te-aka-psira-a-t
peccary-NUC 3C-food-eat-TH 3C-AUXhabit:PL-EVID:PL-TH-NEAR.PAST
‘The peccaries were eating their food (NON-WITNESSED).’
text: Nilson Tupari, narrator

c. Ototot òpot waohi’anâ tero’a
o-toto-t òpot wao-hî’a-nê-a tero’e-a
1SG-grandfather-NUC DISTANT.PAST caiman-like-VBZ-TH AUXGO:SG-TH
te’ekapnâ.
te-’eka-pn-a
3C-AUXhabit:SG-EVID:SG-TH
‘My grandfather used to like caiman (NON-WITNESSED).’
casual discourse: 2018-08-09

In (3a) there is no auxiliary present, so singular evidential -pn attaches directly to the lexical verb pat ‘marry’. In (3b) ko ‘eat’ is followed by the auxiliary aka, so plural evidential -psira attaches to aka. Finally, two auxiliaries are present in (3c): tero’e and ‘eka. The evidential suffix necessarily attaches to the rightmost – which is to say, the structurally highest – of the two auxiliaries.⁴

Tense morphology in Tupará is a heterogenous category; it includes second position particles, predicate-final suffixes, and post-verbal auxiliaries. Evidential -pn/-psira combines without issue with past tense marking regardless of where this marking sits in the clause. The examples in (3) show -pn/-psira combining with near past -t (a predicate-final suffix) and with distant past òpot (a second position particle). The fact that -pn/-psira always sits closer to the verbal root than tense

⁴There is no obligatory marking of number as an inflectional category in the Tupará nominal domain. Hence an NP like pot’at ‘peccary+NUC’ could be interpreted as singular or plural depending on context. We can tell that pot’at is interpreted as plural in (3b) since it triggers plural agreement in both the auxiliary root and the evidential suffix.
Figure 1: The respective positions of the Evidential Phrase and the Tense Phrase in Tuparí

The description of the (singular) evidential morpheme in Alves (2004:§4.3.2.2) as *na*-*pna*-*mna* conflates the evidential with the theme vowel *-a*, which is a separate formative in the language. The theme vowel triggers the deletion of an immediately prior *-e* without exception: *apsi’e ‘hear’ → apsi’a; morē ‘throw, play’ → moră; oro’e ‘AUXGO:PAUC’ → oro’a; yē ‘AUXhzntl.SG’ → yā. The theme vowel also frequently causes *-o* and *-i* to delete, though there is some lexical idiosyncrasy: *sī ‘spear, kill, sting’ → sa; nī ‘feel embarrassment’ → niā; ko ‘eat, drink’ → kā; ato ‘bathe’ → atoa. As a general rule, the theme vowel must be present on the highest verb/auxiliary when there is a clause-initial NP subject. When an NP subject occurs in some other position or is absent, the highest verb/auxiliary will lack the theme vowel. (4) illustrates this contrast. Compare *te’ekapnā* (with final /ā/) against *i’ekapnē* (with final /ē/):6

---

6Singerman (2018a:250–271) argues that the Tupari Tense Phrase does not exhibit uniform headedness: some of its realizations are head-initial while others are head-final. This split in headedness is not important for making sense of the respective positions of the Evidential Phrase and the Tense Phrase, so I give only a head-initial TP in the trees in this article. In addition, the trees omit the AgrS projection proposed in Singerman (2018a:272–284) to account for the distribution of the language’s nominative agreement enclitics.

6The change in person marking on the auxiliary – from coreferent *te*- in (4a) to disjoint *y*- in (4b) – is also connected to the position of the NP subject (Singerman 2018a:181–187).
Theme vowel -a deletes final vowel of the singular evidential

(a) Pamēkgen  ōpot mōket malokare ototonā
   Pamēk-en  ōpot mōket maloka-re o-toto-nē-a
   Pamēk-NUC DISTANT.PAST long.ago maloca-OBL 1SG-grandfather-VBZ-TH
tero’a       te’ekapnē.
tero’e-a    te’eka-pnē-a
   AUXGO:SG-TH 3C-AUXhabit:SG-EVID:SG-TH
   ‘Pamēk was my grandfather in the maloca [communal long house] (NON-WITNESSED).’
casual discourse: 2017-08-04

(b) Mōket  ōpot malokare Pamēkgen ototonā
    mōket ōpot maloka-re Pamēk-en o-toto-nē-a
    long.ago DISTANT.PAST maloca-OBL Pamēk-NUC 1SG-grandfather-VBZ-TH
tero’a       i’ekapnē.
tero’e-a    i’eka-pnē
   AUXGO:SG-TH 3C-AUXhabit:SG-EVID:SG
   ‘Pamēk was my grandfather in the maloca (NON-WITNESSED).’
elicitation: 2018-07-29

In (a) the NP subject Pamēkgen is clause-initial, positioned immediately prior to the second position distant past particle ōpot. Because this NP is clause-initial, it triggers the appearance of the theme vowel on the highest auxiliary. That auxiliary therefore takes the shape te’ekapnē, with final /ā/. In (b), however, Pamēkgen occurs to the right of the tense particle ōpot, and the final auxiliary is i’ekapnē – with the underlying /ē/ of the evidential spared from deletion. This alternation provides clear evidence that the singular evidential ends in /ē/, not /ā/.

The theme vowel has no audible effect when added to a verbal base that already ends in /a/ or /ā/: ‘apkạ ‘fry’ → ‘apkạ; mā ‘place inside of something’ → mā. Since the plural evidential suffix also ends in /a/, the position of the NP subject does not impact its pronunciation:

(5) Theme vowel -a does not affect realization of the plural evidential

(a) Tupari’earet  ōpot wappe te’era te’anā
   Tupari’-eat-et  ōpot wap-pe te’et-a te’anē-a
   Tupari-many-NUC DISTANT.PAST hammock-LOC 3C-sleep-TH 3C-AUXGO:PL-TH
teakapsira.
te-aka-psira-a
   3C-AUXhabit:PL-EVID:PL-TH
   ‘The Tupari used to sleep regularly in hammocks (NON-WITNESSED).’
elicitation: 2018-08-16
b. Wappe òpot Tupari’earet te’era te’anà
wap-pe òpot Tupari-’eat-et te-’et-a te-’anè-a
hammock-LOC DISTANT.PAST Tuparí-many-NUC 3C-sleep-TH 3C-AUX_GO:PL-TH sakapsira.
s-aka-psira
3-AUXhabit:PL-EVID:PL
‘The Tuparí used to sleep regularly in hammocks (NON-WITNESSED).’
elicitation: 2018-08-16

This pair shows the same contrast illustrated above in (4): the position of the NP subject Tupari’earet ‘the Tuparí’ determines the presence/absence of the theme vowel on the highest auxiliary. Yet because the theme vowel has no audible effect on preceding /a/, the final vowel of the plural evidential suffix is always realized the same way.7

The contrast between witnessed and non-witnessed past tense events is a clausal-level category in Tuparí. It is not sufficient to signal the contrast once, at the beginning of a discourse; rather, the distinction must be made anew in every finite clause. The textual excerpt in (6) illustrates. Every finite clause in this text contains both ancient past kut and -pnè/-psira.

(6) a. Mõket kut kire’öerë, kiakoet koepa eanà kirenà
mõket kut kire-’om-ere kiakop-et koepa eanà kire-nè-a
long.ago ANCIENT.PAST person-NEG-OBL sun-NUC moon and person-VBZ-TH
soro’epsira.
s-oro’e-psira
3-AUX_GO:PAUC-EVID:PL
‘Long ago, when there were no other people, the sun and the moon were people (NON-WITNESSED).’
b. Here kut koepat tekoit meop
here kut koepa-t te-koy-t meop
and/then ANCIENT.PAST sun-NUC 3C-sister.of.man-NUC fool.around.with
tet’e-pnam.
tet’e-pnè-am
AUX_GO:SG-EVID:SG-ADV.FOC
‘And the moon started to fool around with his own sister (NON-WITNESSED).’

---

7 The same phonological effects are triggered by adverbial focus -ap, actor nominalizer -at, and multipurpose nominalizer -ap (Singerman 2018a:384–388). The label “theme vowel” goes back to Caspar and Rodrigues (1957:§3.3.4.3) and appears in work on other Tuparian languages as well (e.g., Galucio 2001:88–90 on Sakurabia and Aragon 2014:229–232 on Akuntsú). Aragon (2014) discusses the problematic status of the theme vowel in Akuntsú; some of the issues she highlights apply to Tuparí, as well, but I cannot address those here for reasons of space.
c.  Here  kut  koepat  sim’em  tekoy  wapsim  
  here  kut  koepa-t  sim’ë-m  te-koy  wap-sim
and/then  ANCIENT.PAST  moon-NUC  night-INS  3C-sister.of.man  hammock-inside
  temā  tewārā  i’ekapnē.
  te-mā-a  te-wan-a  i’eka-psira
3C-lay-TH  3C-go.nearby-TH  3-AUX.SG-EVID:SG
‘And the moon, at night, would go a short distance and lay down in his own sister’s hammock (NON-WITNESSED).’

This excerpt comes from a myth that took place long before the author (or any other living person) was born – hence the obligatoriness of the ancient past tense particle kut in each clause. However, -psira is not restricted to such remote times. Except for the durative and same-day past (Appendix A), -psira can be used whenever the event being related took place prior to the moment of speaking.

4 Evidentiality and clause typing

This section examines the interaction between -psira and the set of second position clause-typing particles in Tuparí. The data examined here will demonstrate that the language’s distinction between witnessed and non-witnessed past tense events is restricted to a clear subset of clause types. In particular, the evidential contrast is neutralized by clause-typing particles that express doubt, uncertainty, or ignorance on the part of the speaker.

Table 2 lists the language’s overt clause-typing particles. These morphemes occupy the first slot in the second position particle cluster; they head a head-initial projection located in the highest layer of the clause. In Figure 1 that projection is labeled C (see also Singerman 2018a:240–249).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Syntactic feature of clause-initial constituent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘aet</td>
<td>it’s a shame that not p</td>
<td>−wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mākērō</td>
<td>dunno</td>
<td>+wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mākērō</td>
<td>confirmative</td>
<td>−wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nākop</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>−wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāpe</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
<td>±wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nē</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td>−wh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pa’a/ta’a</td>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>−wh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These particles are sensitive to whether the clause-initial constituent is a wh-word (apo ‘who’, kat’at ‘what’, katkaere ‘when’) or is a pied-piped phrase that contains a wh-word (apo ha’up ‘whose son’). Only nāpe ‘emphatic’ and mākērō ‘dunno’ may occur with a wh-word:


Sensitivity of clause-typing particles to \([±wh]\) status of the clause-initial constituent

a. *Katkaere nāpe o-memsiremsiren tēsapwa y’e?!
   katkaere nāpe o-memsiremsin-en te-s-a-pwa y’-e
   when emphatic 1SG-grandchild-NUC 3C-come:SG-TH-NEAR.FUTURE 3-AUX:SG
   ‘When on earth is my grandchild going to come here?!’
   casual discourse: 2016-11-11

b. *Katkaere mākērō o-memsiremsiren tēsapwa y’e.
   katkaere mākērō o-memsiremsin-en te-s-a-pwa y’-e
   when dunno 1SG-grandchild-NUC 3C-come:SG-TH-NEAR.FUTURE 3-AUX:SG
   ‘I don’t know when my grandchild will come here.’
   elicitation: 2017-08-06

c. *Katkaere *ta’a / *nē / *’aet / *nākop o-memsiremsiren tēsapwa y’e
   elicitation: 2017-08-06

Because *nāpe often serves to express surprise or disbelief on the part of the speaker, I translate it as ‘on earth’ in content questions and as ‘really’ in polar questions.

There are two homophonous clause-typing particles: *mākērō ‘dunno’ utilized in content questions and the tag-like *mākērō ‘confirmative’ utilized in polar questions. The two display different behaviors with regards to evidential marking, as discussed below. They are also accompanied by distinct prosodies: there is a sharp intonational rise at the end of polar questions with *mākērō ‘confirmative’, but no such rise takes place with *mākērō ‘dunno’. There is never any uncertainty about which of the two is present in a given utterance: polar questions may not contain a *wh-word, whereas *mākērō ‘dunno’ always requires one.

4.1 Evidential contrast is maintained with assertive particles *pa’a and *ta’a

The gender-indexing assertive particles *pa’a and *ta’a (sometimes shortened to *pa and *ta) are often used when answering polar questions; when showing strong agreement with something that has already been said; or when stressing the veracity or accuracy of a proposition. The following exchange between two women illustrates a typical usage of *pa’a/*ta’a.

(8) Typical exchange with *pa’a/*ta’a ‘assertive’ utilized in response

a. *Esa nē ‘en?
   e-s-a nē ‘en
   2SG-come:SG-TH yes/no 2SG
   ‘Did you come?’ / ‘Have you arrived?’
b. *He, ðosa  ta’a  ’on.
   hè,  o-s-a  ta’a  ’on
yes 1SG-come:SG-TH **assertive.Ø 1SG

  ‘Yes, I did indeed come.’

  casual discourse: 2016-01-22

Past tense clauses that bear *pa’a/ta’a continue to draw a witnessed versus non-witnessed distinction, just as superficially unmarked declaratives do. The discourse contexts in (9) highlight the kinds of situations in which speakers may wish or need to emphasize that a particular event took place even though they were not present to witness it.

(9) Examples of *pa’a/ta’a cooccurring with evidential -pnẽ/-psira

a. CONTEXT: I ask my friend whether her father has arrived in town for medical treatment. Although she did not see him arrive, she confirms that he did so.

   *Herowap  *ta  *ipnẽ.
   herōwap  ta’a  ip-nē

  yesterday **assertive.Ø come:SG-EVID:SG

  ‘He did indeed come here yesterday (NON-WITNESSED).’

  casual discourse: 2017-08-04

b. CONTEXT: I see many fish in my friend’s home and remark that his sons, who’d gone fishing earlier that day, must have done well. Even though he did not accompany them on the river, he confirms that they did so.

   *Tāramkapsira  *pa’ae.
   Ø-tāramka-psira-a  *pa’a  e

  3-kill.many-EVID:PL-TH **assertive.Ø 3

  ‘They did indeed kill many [fish] (NON-WITNESSED).’

  casual discourse: 2016-12-01

c. CONTEXT: In a myth about the origin of the sun and the moon, a mother sees the temporary genipapo dye around her son’s eye despite his best efforts to wash it off.

   *Ero’are  *ta’a  *kut  isît  itopnam
   ’ero’are  ta’a  kut  i-si-t  i-top-nē-am

  meanwhile **assertive.Ø ANCIENT.PAST 3-mother-NUC 3-see-EVID:SG-ADV.FOC

  sepa  ’ü-t-pe
  3-eye painted-NUC-LOC

  ‘All the while, his mother did indeed see it – his painted eye (NON-WITNESSED).’

text: Marilza Kabatoá Tupari, narrator
Whereas (a) and (b) are taken from conversations that I participated in, (c) comes from a traditional narrative. Note that ancient past *kut* is present in this last example. As will be discussed in Section 4.3, below, *kut* always cooccurs with -pn̄e/-psira in declarative clauses; in certain non-declaratives, however, *kut* can occur without -pn̄e/-psira. That -pn̄e/-psira is present with *kut* in (9c) shows that assertive-marked utterances are like unmarked declaratives in that they maintain the witnessed/non-witnessed contrast. In the next subsection we will see that this contrast is also maintained in biased polar questions marked with mākērō ‘confirmative’. However, it undergoes a deictic inversion from speaker to addressee in polar questions marked with nē ‘yes/no’ or nāpe ‘emphatic’, as well as in content questions that lack an overt clause-typing particle.

### 4.2 Evidential contrast undergoes Interrogative Flip in a subset of question types

Polar questions in Tuparí may bear one of three different clause-typing particles: nē ‘yes/no’, mākērō ‘confirmative’, or nāpe ‘emphatic’. Questions with mākērō ‘confirmative’ are biased: speakers use this particle when seeking confirmation of a fact they already suspect to be true. (10), which a speaker asked me one month after my brother got married, contains mākērō ‘confirmative’ rather than nē ‘yes/no’. The speaker employed mākērō instead of nē because she had already heard about my brother’s wedding and was confident that it had taken place.

(10) Easat mākērō tea’usi patnan?
    e-asa-t mākērō te-a’usi pat-nē-a-n
    2SG-old.brother-NUC confirmative 3C-wife marry-EVID:SG-TH-NEAR.PAST
    ‘Your older brother got married, right (NON-WITNESSED)?’

Observe that (10) contains the singular evidential -pnē. This morpheme must be present because my friend was not present to witness my brother get married. In other words, polar questions that bear mākērō ‘confirmative’ behave just like the declarative and assertive clause types described in Section 4.1: the deictic origo of evidential -pnē/-psira remains anchored to the speaker.

The witnessed/non-witnessed contrast behaves differently in polar questions that contain nē ‘yes/no’. In these questions (which are more neutral and more frequent than ones with mākērō ‘confirmative’) the origo of -pnē/-psira inverts from speaker to addressee. (11) illustrates this inversion. Whereas the speaker of (10) seeks confirmation of a fact that she already suspects to be true, the speaker of (11) is simply requesting information.
Evidential -pnē/-psira is necessarily absent from (11) because the addressee – the party who will need to answer the question – did in fact witness his brother get married. So in polar questions with nē the presence/absence of -pnē/-psira is determined not by the speaker’s evidential status but rather by the speaker’s expectation of the addressee’s evidential status. This switch in deictic anchoring from speaker to addressee is referred to as Interrogative Flip in the literature (see Garrett 2001; Faller 2002; Friedman 2003; Murray 2017; San Roque et al. 2017; Bhadra 2018). When asked during elicitation sessions, consultants have clear judgments about the behavior of -pnē/-psira in questions. If singular evidential -pnē were removed from (10) (with mākēro ‘confirmative’), the speaker would be requesting confirmation of a marrying event that she herself had witnessed. Conversely, if -pnē were inserted into (11) (with nē ‘yes/no’), then the speaker would be requesting her addressee to confirm a marrying event that he had not witnessed.

Interrogative Flip also applies with nāpe ‘emphatic’, the only particle capable of combining with both [+wh] and [−wh] clause-initial constituents. That Interrogative Flip occurs with nāpe is shown by the three utterances in (12).

(12) Interrogative Flip applies with nāpe ‘emphatic’

a. Wararo nāpe nā ēsat ‘en?!
   wararo nāpe nā e-s-a-t ‘en
   only.briefly emphatic FOCUS 2SG-come:SG-TH-NEAR.PAST 2SG
   ‘Did you really come here for just a short while (WITNESSED)no’!
   elicitation: 2017-08-06 (based on casual discourse: 2016-11-09)

b. Wararo nā èynan ‘en!
   wararo nā e-s-nē-a-n ‘en
   only.briefly FOCUS 2SG-come:SG-EVID:SG-TH-NEAR.PAST 2SG
   ‘You came here for just a short while (NON-WITNESSED)’!
   elicitation: 2017-09-02 (based on casual discourse: 2017-08-07)

c. # Wararo nāpe nā èynan ‘en?!
   wararo nāpe nā e-s-nē-a-n ‘en
   only.briefly emphatic FOCUS 2SG-come:SG-EVID:SG-TH-NEAR.PAST 2SG
   (intended to mean the same as 12a)
   elicitation: 2017-09-02

Examples (a) and (b) were spoken to me on separate occasions but in identical contexts: in each
case I informed my interlocutor that I had come to the Rio Branco Reserve for only a few weeks’
time, and in each case my interlocutor expressed surprise at the brevity of my visit. Since neither
speaker had seen me arrive, one would expect both (a) and (b) to bear non-witnessed morphol-
yogy. Yet nāpe, in (a), causes the deictic origo of the evidential contrast to switch from speaker
to addressee; and since I did witness my own arriving, -pnē/-psira is absent from that utterance. Combining -pnē/-psira with nāpe, as in (c), is infelicitous in this context.8

In content questions the deictic origo switches from speaker to addressee just like in polar
questions marked by nē ‘yes/no’ or nāpe ‘emphatic’. When a speaker asks someone where she
was born, -pnē/-psira is required; after all, no one can witness her own birth. Hence -pnē is
obligatory in (13a). If, however, one asks a woman where her child was born, the evidential will
be absent – since mothers do witness giving birth. This is why there is no -pnē in (13b).

(13) Interrogative Flip takes place in content questions

a. Pare ōpot esit esinemnam?
pare ōpot e-si-t e-sinē-mmē-am
where DISTANT.PAST 2SG-mother-NUC 2SG-give.birth.to-EVID:SG-ADV.FOC
‘Where did your mother give birth to you (NON-WITNESSED)?’
elicitation: 2018-07-29

b. Pare ōpot ’en nā ememsiret sinam?
pare ōpot ’en nā e-memsit-et sinē-am
where DISTANT.PAST 2SG FOCUS 2SG-child.of.woman-NUC give.birth.to-ADV.FOC
‘Where did you give birth to your child (WITNESSED)?’
elicitation: 2018-07-29

This pair shows that in normal content questions the deictic origo of the witnessed/non-witnessed
contrast undergoes Interrogative Flip from speaker to addressee. In this sense content questions
behave identically to non-biased polar interrogatives (with nē ‘yes/no’) and to questions that con-
tain nāpe ‘emphatic’. This set of sentence types contrasts against declarative utterances with no

8Singerman (2018a:329–330) presented the three utterances in (12) as evidence that nāpe and -pnē/-psira can never
coccur. Further fieldwork showed that conclusion to be incorrect: nāpe and -pnē/-psira can cooccur provided that
the context is appropriate. Example (12c) is therefore infelicitous rather than ungrammatical. A naturally occurring
element where nāpe combines with -pnē/-psira is given in (i):

(i) Koloradore nāpe yēmo’āksirap?!
Kolorado-re nāpe y-emo’āk-sira-ap
Colorado-OBL emphatic 3-pass.by-EVID:PL-ADV.FOC
‘Have they really passed by Colorado (NON-WITNESSED)?!’
casual discourse: 2018-08-09

This question was spoken by a woman who was waiting for her friends to arrive in the village of Cajut, several hours
downriver from the village of Colorado. Her husband had heard over the radio that the friends had already passed by
Colorado. Since he received this news secondhand, his wife’s question to him contains -pnē/-psira.
overt clause-typing particle, extra-assertive declaratives with pa’a/ta’a, and biased questions with mākērō ‘confirmative’, all of which fail to trigger Interrogative Flip.

4.3 Evidential contrast is neutralized in contexts of uncertainty or ignorance

While the deictic orientation of -pnē/-psira undergoes Interrogative Flip from speaker to addressee in a subset of interrogative contexts, in other clause types the witnessed/non-witnessed evidential contrast is neutralized altogether. This subsection examines the interaction between -pnē/-psira and two further clause-typing particles: nākop ‘maybe’ and mākērō ‘dunno’. These two particles form a natural class in that they both express uncertainty or ignorance. Importantly, neither can cooccur with evidential -pnē/-psira.

Dubitative nākop does the opposite work of pa’a/ta’a ‘assertive’. Whereas pa’a/ta’a serves to emphasize the speaker’s commitment to a given proposition, nākop is how speakers minimize their commitment to or confidence in the reliability of \( p \). That nākop lessens the speaker’s commitment to \( p \) is clear from disjunctions with pare ‘either/or’. Such disjunctions usually bring together whole independent utterances, each containing a clause-typing particle.

(14) CONTEXT: A speaker says that he does not know the sex of his family’s pet parrot.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Okio nākop pare aramirā nākop.} \\
\text{okio nākop \( \emptyset \) pare aramirā nākop \( \emptyset \)} \\
[ \text{male} \text{maybe 3} ] \text{either/or} [ \text{female} \text{maybe 3} ]
\end{align*}
\]

‘It might be a male or it might be a female.’

casual discourse: 2016-01-10

As it is not possible for a pet parrot to be both male and female, disjunctions such as this one demonstrate that when speakers use nākop, they make no commitment to \( p \).

Crucially, nākop never combines with evidential -pnē/-psira. The passage in (15) illustrates. This story tells how a violent monkey jumped out of a tree in the forest and bit the narrator on the arm when she was just a little girl. When she returns to the village, her mother asks what happened. The mother had not accompanied her daughter into the forest, so she had not been present to witness the monkey attack. (15) is how the mother replies when her daughter says that it may have been a we’u’u ‘Night Monkey (Aotus sp.)’ that bit her.

(15) a. Te’anaē we’u’u non, 
\( \text{te’-anē-a e we’u’u nō-n} \) 
3C-AUXGO:PL-TH 3 night.monkey other-NUC

‘There are other night monkeys,’
b.  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tenō} & \quad \text{ôporo} & \quad \text{pesap} & \quad \text{hèt}, & \quad \text{kiret} & \quad \text{amsi wek pesap} \\
\text{tenō} & \quad \text{ôpo-ro} & \quad \text{pesap} & \quad \text{hèt}, & \quad \text{kire-t} & \quad \text{amsi wek pesap} \\
\end{align*}
\]


hèt 

NMZhè-NUC 

‘ones that will kill people, ones that will bite a person’s nose.’

c.  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Hè} & \quad \text{nàkop} & \quad \text{nerō} & \quad \text{’at.} \\
\text{hè} & \quad \text{nàkop} & \quad \text{∅} & \quad \text{nē-ro} & \quad \text{’e-a-t} \\
\end{align*}
\]

that.one maybe 3 do.so-NMZ AUX.SG-TH-NUC 

‘Maybe that’s the kind that did it [i.e., bit you].’

d.  

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Nàpe} & \quad \text{nā} & \quad \text{ewekawekakapnam.} \\
\text{nàpe} & \quad \text{∅} & \quad \text{nē e-wekaweka-ka-pnē-am} \\
\end{align*}
\]

that’s why 3 FOCUS 2SG-bite -VBZ-EVID:SG-ADV:FOC 

‘That’s why it bit you over and over (NON-WITNESSED).’

text: Iracema Taydyup Tupari, narrator

The mother begins in line (a) with an existential: \text{Te’anaē we’u’u non} ‘There are other night monkeys’. She then clarifies, in (b), that this other kind of \text{we’u’u} is vicious: it will kill people and will bite their noses. (This line contains two internally headed relative clauses of the sort discussed in Section 5.) The crucial data come in (c) and (d). In (c) the mother speculates that it is this other, violent variety of \text{we’u’u} that attacked her daughter. Here singular evidential \text{-pnē} does not appear. Then in (d) – which does not contain \text{nàkop} – \text{-pnē} reappears. Lines (c) and (d) both refer to the same biting event, which the mother was not present to witness; but as (c) contains \text{nàkop}, the evidential suffix must be omitted. The mutual exclusivity of \text{-pnē/psira} and \text{nàkop} is systematic in my corpus of texts and conversation.

Comparable neutralization takes place with \text{mākērō} ‘dunno’. This particle converts content questions into statements of ignorance; it must always cooccur with a [+\text{wh}] clause-initial constituent. The following near-minimal pair demonstrates this particle’s effect:

(16) Effect of \text{mākērō} ‘dunno’ on interpretation of content questions

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \text{Katkaere ke } & \quad \text{’en} & \quad \text{eteronom} & \quad \text{ekuydyo?} \\
\text{katkaere ke} & \quad \text{’en} & \quad \text{e-tet-ronā-am} & \quad \text{e-kuy-o} \\
\text{when POLITE.FUTURE 2SG 2SG-go:SG-again-ADV:FOC 2SG-land-INS} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘When are you going back to your land?’

casual discourse: 2016-01-07
Content questions converted into statements of ignorance by mäkërô lose the ability to combine with -pnē/-psira, just as statements of doubt hedged with näkop do. Consider the passage in (17), spoken by a mother after I pointed out a dead snake by the riverbank. She did not see the snake get killed, which is why the first and fourth lines are marked as non-witnessed.

(17) a. Yōoppsïræ.
   y-ōpo-psïr-a e
3-kill-EVID:PL-TH 3
   ‘They killed it (NON-WITNESSED).’

b. Têpapsëæ.
   te-pap-së-a e
3C-die-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-TH 3
   ‘It is dead, lying there.’

c. Apo mäkërô nerō ’at.
   apo mäkërô nerō ’e-a-t
who dunno do.it AUX:SG-TH-NUC
   ‘I don’t know who did it [=killed it].’

d. Ah! Omëmsit a’usi nā nemnan.
   Ah! o-mëmsit a’usi e nā nē-mnē-a-n
INTERJECTION 1SG-child.of.woman wife 3 FOCUS do.it-EVID:SG-TH-NUC
   ‘[After her daughter whispers in her ear] Ah! It was my son’s wife who did it (NON-WITNESSED).’

casual discourse: 2018-08-04

Line (c), which contains mäkërô ‘dunno’, refers to the same snake-killing event discussed in (a) and (d). Yet while (a) and (d) contain evidential -pnē/-psira, content questions transformed by mäkërô into statements of ignorance cannot. This is why line (c) lacks -pnē.9

The neutralization of evidential morphology in clauses marked by näkop ‘maybe’ or mäkërô ‘dunno’ helps to disentangle the categories of tense and evidentiality from one another. The ancient past particle kut, though somewhat archaic in the speech of younger Tuparí, remains ubiquitous in the speech of the elderly; it shows up without fail in myths and narratives about prehistory. As kut

9Line (17b) contains the horizontal singular resultative -psë. See Section 6 for discussion of the connection between the evidential and resultative suffixes, which are partially homophonous.
is used with events that took place no later than the speaker’s birth – events which, by definition, the speaker could not have witnessed – it is invariably accompanied by -pnē/-psira in declarative clauses. (See the textual excerpt in 6, in Section 3.) Consider, however, the following pair of utterances, both spoken by the same elderly woman:

(18) Neutralization of evidential distinction with mākērō ‘dunno’

a. Tan’omnā kut osít tet’epnē.
tán’-om-nē-a kut o-si-t tet’e-pnē
tall-NEG-VBZ-TH 1SG-mother-NUC AUXGO:SG-EVID:SG
‘She wasn’t tall, my mother (NON-WITNESSED).’
casual discourse: 2014-07-10

b. Pare mākērō kut yan osinā tet’e.
pare mākērō kut yā-n o-sinē-a tet’e
where dunno ANCIENT.PAST mother-NUC 1SG-give.birth.to-TH AUXGO:SG
‘I don’t know where my mother gave birth to me.’
casual discourse: 2017-08-30

The speaker’s mother died shortly after her birth, which is why evidential -pnē is required in (a). While the speaker knows that her mother was a short woman, this piece of information is not something that she ever learned as a firsthand witness. This is a declarative utterance so the witnessed/non-witnessed contrast must be marked. In (b) the same speaker discusses how she does not know where she was born. As far as pieces of information go, the location of her birth should be just like her mother’s height: it is a fact that she could not have learned by witnessing but must have instead been told secondhand. Yet whereas evidential -pnē is obligatory in (a), it is absent in (b). The crucial difference is that (a) is a declarative with no overt clause-typing particle, whereas (b) contains mākērō ‘dunno’. We see, then, that the obligatory cooccurrence of ancient past kut with -pnē/-psira in declaratives can be overridden: in clauses marked with nākop ‘maybe’ or mākērō ‘dunno’, kut can and must appear without an evidential suffix.10

4.4 Summary: how evidentiality interacts with clause type

The interaction between the second position clause-typing particles and the non-witnessed evidential suffix -pnē/-psira is summarized in Table 3. Per the argumentation for the existence of null complementizers in Singerman (2018a:265–268), Table 3 includes the interrogative complementizer head that I assume is present in superficially unmarked content interrogatives as well as

---

10 A reviewer requests grammaticality judgments to show that mākērō ‘dunno’ and nākop ‘maybe’ can never cooccur with evidential -pnē/-psira. Although such cooccurrences are systematically absent in natural speech, some consultants do approve them in elicitation – typically with a fair degree of hesitation. I believe that the marginal acceptability of these utterances for some speakers stems from the mismatch in question being semantic rather than morphosyntactic. As argued in Section 5, it is a presuppositional clash (rather than some morphosyntactic constraint) that prevents mākērō and nākop from occurring with -pnē/-psira.
Table 3: Interaction between second position clause-typing particles and the witnessed/non-witnessed contrast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Type of clause-initial constituent</th>
<th>How confident is the speaker in p?</th>
<th>Is this particle compatible with -pnë/-psira?</th>
<th>Who serves as the deictic origo of -pnë/-psira?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pa'a/ta'a</td>
<td>assertive</td>
<td>-wh</td>
<td>maximally confident</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅</td>
<td>declarative</td>
<td>-wh</td>
<td>confident</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mākērō</td>
<td>confirmative</td>
<td>-wh</td>
<td>relatively confident</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>the speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nē</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
<td>-wh</td>
<td>low/zero confidence (speaker is requesting information)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>the addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅</td>
<td>wh-question</td>
<td>+wh</td>
<td>low/zero confidence (speaker is requesting information)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>the addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nāpe</td>
<td>emphatic</td>
<td>±wh</td>
<td>low/zero confidence (speaker is requesting information)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>the addressee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nākop</td>
<td>maybe</td>
<td>-wh</td>
<td>zero confidence (speaker cannot say whether p is true or not)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mākērō</td>
<td>dunno</td>
<td>+wh</td>
<td>zero confidence (speaker is ignorant of a piece of information)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the non-interrogative complementizer head present in neutral declaratives. (It does not however include ‘aet ‘it’s a shame that not p’, discussed in greater length in Appendix A.)

In terms of their syntactic behaviors three natural classes of particles emerge. First, biased polar questions (with mākērō ‘confirmative’) and extra-assertive declaratives (with pa’a/ta’a) behave identically to superficially unmarked declaratives: evidential -pnē/-psira must be used whenever the speaker relates an action or occurrence that he or she did not personally witness. Interrogative Flip of the deictic origo of -pnē/-psira from speaker to addressee does not take place. What unites these clause types is that they all involve a high degree of commitment on the speaker’s part to p. Second, in non-biased polar questions – marked with nē ‘yes/no’ or nāpe ‘emphatic’ – and in content interrogatives without an overt clause-typing particle, the deictic orientation of -pnē/-psira undergoes Interrogative Flip. The different behavior seen in polar questions marked by nē or nāpe when compared to those that contain mākērō conforms to the typology of Bhadra (2018), who observes that Flip often fails to apply in biased questions. Third, -pnē/-psira cannot appear in clauses marked with mākērō ‘dunno’ or nākop ‘maybe’. This neutralization of the witnessed/non-witnessed contrast must be conditioned by semantic factors. All of these particles occupy the same position within the second position enclitic cluster and behave identically according to syntactic constituency diagnostics (Singerman 2018a:243–249). Given that -pnē/-psira can occur in unmarked declaratives, assertive declaratives, yes/no questions, and content questions that lack an overt clause-typing particle, syntactic restrictions cannot explain the neutralization that applies with mākērō ‘dunno’ and nākop ‘maybe’. The explanation must instead rest with the semantics, as argued further in Section 5.

While evidential marking is compatible with only a subset of clause types – that is, evidentiality is asymmetrically dependent on clause type – the same is not true for tense: the full range of tense morphology is compatible with all varieties of clause-typing particles. (19) shows three of the many possible combinations of tense and clause-typing morphology.

(19) Tense, unlike evidentiality, is not sensitive to clause type

a. Katkaere mākērō  ke  omākap.
katkaere mākērō ke e o-māk-ap
when dunno POLITE.FUTURE 3 1SG-send-ADV.FOC
‘I don’t know when they will send me off.’
casual discourse: 2016-03-26

b. Kanā nāpe  ko  ’ote  eōpo?
kanā nāpe ko ’ote e-ōpo?
why emphatic POLITE.FUTURE 1PL:EXCL 2SG-kill
‘Why on earth should we-EXCL kill you?’
text: Marilza Kabatoã Tupari, narrator
What is more, there are no asymmetrical dependencies between polarity and clause type. Although 'aet ‘it’s a shame that not p’ does not occur with the negative suffix -'om (see Appendix A), all of the other clause-typing particles may combine with -'om. Example (19c) shows assertive ta’a together with -'om; two further combinations are given in (20).

(20) Polarity, unlike evidentiality, is not sensitive to clause type

   a. Ham nē tẹyto’omkap’a y’e?
      ham nē te-s-to-'om-ka-a-p’a y’e
      hither yes/no 3C-come:SG-NMZ-NEG-VBZ-TH-NEAR.FUTURE 3-AUX:SG
      ‘Is he not going to come here?’
      casual discourse: 2015-10-08

   b. Otero’omkap’a nākop o’e.
      o-tet-ro-'om-ka-a-p’a nākop o’e
      1SG-go:SG-NMZ-NEG-VBZ-TH-NEAR.FUTURE maybe 1SG-AUX:SG
      ‘I may not go.’ / ‘Maybe I am not going to go.’
      casual discourse: 2015-12-12

These examples demonstrate that evidentiality is unique within the set of clausal-level categories in Tuparí: unlike tense and polarity, it is highly susceptible to changes in clause type.

5 Evidential -pnē/-psira presupposes commitment to p: evidence from embedded clauses

This section argues that evidential -pnē/-psira can be used only in contexts that presuppose commitment on the part of the deictic origo to the veracity, accuracy, or reliability of the proposition p. Key evidence comes from the behavior of the witnessed/non-witnessed contrast inside of embedded clauses. In addition to explaining why the particles nākop ‘maybe’ and mākērō ‘dunno’ cannot cooccur with -pnē/-psira, the presuppositional analysis advanced here accounts for the availability of evidential marking in embedded existentials.

Although the closest relatives of Tuparí use non-finite nominalizations in lieu of finite embedded clauses (see Galucio 2011a,b for Sakurabí), Tuparí has innovated an embedded clause construction in which the full range of second position tense particles, predicate-final tense suffixes, and post-verbal tense auxiliaries may occur (Singerman 2019 [to appear]). These embedded
clauses – frequently used as internally headed relatives – take the nominalizer ḡè at their right edge. This nominalizer is in turn capable of hosting the full range of case morphology. (21) shows an internally headed relative clause where the internal head is the third person pronominal proclitic s-, attached to the lexical verb at ‘grab, catch, get’.

(21) sara  wat’otsirat  wat ḡè
s-at-a  wat-ot-sira-a-t  wat ] ḡè
‘the one(s) that you-PL went to get (NON-WITNESSED)’

casual discourse: 2018-08-30

Section 3 argued that the TP is higher than the EvidP in the Tuparí clause (see also Singerman 2018a: chapter five). Because any portion of the Tuparí clause that contains a TP must contain an EvidP as well, we predict that the witnessed versus non-witnessed distinction ought to be maintained in all embedded environments where tense is realized. This prediction is correct. Just as finite embedded clauses may contain the full range of tense marking known from matrix clauses, they also maintain the witnessed/non-witnessed evidential distinction. (22) provides the witnessed counterpart to (21).

(22) sara  wat’orat  wat ḡè
s-at-a  wat-ot-a-t  wat ] ḡè
‘the one(s) that you-PL went to get (WITNESSED)’
elicitation: 2018-09-01

Of crucial importance is the fact that witnessed/non-witnessed contrast projects out of finite embedded clauses in the fashion of a presupposition. This is clear from the full sentential context for the internally headed relative clause given in (21):

(23) **CONTEXT:** I tell a friend in the village of Serrinha that I had gone to collect kōātek ‘palm grubs’ with some residents of Nazaré, another village which I had visited several days before. I then show my friend in Serrinha a short video of the kōātek. My friend asks whether these are the kōātek that I’d gathered in Nazaré.

Sara  wat’otsirat  wat ḡè  Ṉè?
s-at-a  wat-ot-sira-a-t  wat ] ḡè  Ṉè  ∅
‘Are those the ones that you-PL went to get (NON-WITNESSED)?’
casual discourse: 2018-08-30
The internally headed relative in (23) is marked as non-witnessed: the verb *ot ‘go:PAUC’ bears plural evidential -psira. The deictic orientation of the embedded evidential continues to be anchored to the speaker: she did not witness me go off to gather the *k̜a*tek, which is why she had to employ -pnê/-psira. Yet the matrix clause contains nê ‘yes/no’, independently known to trigger Interrogative Flip of the deictic origo of -pnê/-psira (Section 4.2). That matrix Interrogative Flip has no effect on the embedded -pnê/-psira shows that -pnê/-psira projects over the matrix particle nê ‘yes/no’. The kind of projection seen here is precisely what one expects from a presupposition (see Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet 1990 on the Family of Sentences diagnostic and, for work on projection in Tupían, Tonhauser et al. 2013).

To the best of my knowledge, (23) cannot be interpreted as asking about the source of evidence for the *k̜a*tek-getting event. Rather, both (a) that I, the addressee, went to gather *k̜a*tek and (b) that the speaker did not see me do so project out of the internally headed relative clause, thereby taking scope over the matrix particle nê ‘yes/no’.

The internally headed relative clause in (23) must host non-witnessed -pnê/-psira no matter what the matrix clause-typing particle is. So nothing changes in the embedded clause if nê ‘yes/no’ is replaced with nâkop ‘maybe’:

(24) Sara wat’otsirat wat hè nâkop.
    s-at-a wat-o-t-sira-a-t wat ] hè nâkop Ø
    ‘Maybe those the ones that you-PL went to get (NON-WITNESSED).’
elicitation: 2018-09-01

As demonstrated in Section 4.3, nâkop cannot cooccur with -pnê/-psira in the same clause. Yet the internally headed relative in (24) contains plural evidential -psira despite the presence of nâkop in the matrix. In elicitation consultants confirm that removing -psira from the internally headed relative in (23) or (24) would work only if the speaker had seen me go off to gather the *k̜a*tek. In other words, it does not matter whether a matrix particle triggers Interrogative Flip of evidential -pnê/-psira (as nê ‘yes/no’ does) or whether it neutralizes the witnessed/non-witnessed contrast altogether (nâkop ‘maybe’); the deictic orientation of -pnê/-psira inside of the embedded clause remains unaffected. This indifference to the matrix clause-typing particle makes sense if the evidential contrast projects in the fashion of a presupposition.

The presuppositional analysis advanced here provides an explanation for the incompatibility between evidential -pnê/-psira, on the one hand, and nâkop ‘maybe’ and mâkér̃o ‘dunno’, on the other. These two clause-typing particles indicate doubt or uncertainty on the speaker’s part – and a speaker cannot presuppose a proposition $p$ when $p$ leaves them doubtful or uncertain. The witnessed/non-witnessed contrast is however fully maintained and remains anchored to the speaker in unmarked declaratives, in assertive clauses with *pa’a/ta’a*, and in biased yes/no questions with
mākērō ‘confirmative’. These are all contexts in which the speaker’s commitment to or confidence in p is already high. The availability of -pnē/-psira therefore correlates with the speaker’s level of commitment to p.

A further advantage of this presuppositional analysis is that it can explain those rare cases where evidential -pnē/-psira occurs in a present existential. Such a case is shown in (25).

(25) CONTEXT: My friend has fallen asleep in the afternoon at her home. A health worker wakes her, having come to pick her up for a medical appointment that is about to begin. Scrambling to get ready to leave, my friend says that she was unaware that she had an appointment that afternoon.

Puop’omnā 'on otet’epnē, okōsultat
puop-‘om-nē-a 'on o-tet’e-pnē
know-NEG-VBZ 1SG AUX$_{GO}$:SG-EVID:SG [ 1SG-appointment-NUC

‘I didn’t know (NON-WITNESSED) that I have an appointment (NON-WITNESSED) / that there is my appointment (NON-WITNESSED).’

Singular evidential -pnē occurs with the matrix verb puop’omnā ‘not know, be ignorant’ here. This is in of itself unsurprising: the speaker was unaware of her own ignorance of the appointment, and -pnē/-psira is always present when speakers express ignorance about the gaps in their knowledge (Appendix A). The evidential suffix also occurs inside of the embedded clause, which bears the oblique case -ere since puop’omnā ‘not know’ – like its counterpart puop ‘know, be knowledgeable about’ – can optionally take an oblique complement. If puop’omnā ‘not know’ presupposes the veracity of its oblique complement, then it makes sense for evidential marking to be licit in the embedded clause. Put slightly differently: because the embedded existential in (25) is presupposed – and because evidential marking in Tuparí requires a presupposition of commitment to p – here one can mark a present existential as non-witnessed, in violation of the language’s otherwise rigid restriction of the evidential contrast to past tense environments.

6 Resultative morphology as the historical source of -pnē/-psira

This section examines the resultative suffix -psē/-pnē/-psira, a verbal morpheme which agrees with the subject in both number and physical position. This suffix attaches to non-stative or change-of-state verbs. The two different singular forms, -psē and -pnē, reflect the physical position of the subject; this positional distinction is neutralized in the plural. The realization of the resultative is
subject to the same two phonological processes of coda nasalization and consonant cluster simplification that the evidential is (Section 3). I will argue here that the resultative served as the diachronic source of evidential -\textit{pnē}/-\textit{psira}, in keeping with our broader understanding of the development of evidential morphology (Friedman 2018).

I follow Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988:6) in treating resultative verb forms as those ‘that express a state implying a previous event’ (see also Nedjalkov 2001). Nedjalkov and Jaxontov make a further distinction between resultatives and statives, identical except that the stative ‘expresses a state of a thing without any implication of its origin’ (Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988:6). It is not clear at present whether Tuparí makes a distinction between stative and resultative verbal morphology in the sense that these authors use the two terms. Nearly all examples of -\textit{psē}/-\textit{pnē}/-\textit{psira} in my corpus imply both a present state as well as the action that led to that state, such that calling this suffix a ‘resultative’ is justified.\footnote{The Tuparí suffix -\textit{psē}/-\textit{pnē}/-\textit{psira} does not instantiate the kind of resultative construction discussed by Beavers (2012) (among others); those involve a secondary predicate in addition to a primary one.}

### 6.1 Basic properties of resultative -\textit{psē}/-\textit{pnē}/-\textit{psira}

As discussed in Section 2, previous work on Tuparí did not disentangle the singular evidential from the theme vowel; in addition, the plural evidential went undiscovered. In the same way, Caspar and Rodrigues (1957:§3.3.4.3) gave -\textit{sā} and -\textit{msā} as the allomorphs of the resultative, but the final /ā/ of these forms is actually the theme vowel. The underlying /ē/ of the singular resultative is deleted by the theme vowel, just as the /ē/ of the singular evidential is (Section 3).

Unlike the evidential, the resultative agrees with singular subjects in terms of physical position: horizontal -\textit{psē} contrasts with vertical -\textit{pnē}. (26a) is what one speaker said to me shortly after I shaved my beard. As I was sitting down at the time, she used horizontal -\textit{psē}. During a subsequent interview, the same speaker confirmed that suffix would change to vertical -\textit{pnē} if I had been standing up; this is shown in (b). She further confirmed that when speaking to an in-law – who must be treated in respectful speech as paucal/plural rather than singular – she would instead employ plural -\textit{psira}. The respectful in-law form is given in (c).
The resultative makes a positional contrast with singular subjects

a. Ėpotekapšā `en eoyē haet atpe.
e-epoteka-psē-a `en e-oyē hap-et at-pe
2SG-change-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-TH 2SG 2SG-mouth hair-NUC cut-after
‘You are changed (SITTING), having shaved off your beard.’ [literally: ‘You are in the horizontal state of being changed, having shaved off your beard.’]
casual discourse: 2017-08-09

b. Ėpotekapnā `en eoyē haet atpe.
e-epoteka-pnē-a `en e-oyē hap-et at-pe
2SG-change-RSLT:SG:VRTCL-TH 2SG 2SG-mouth hair-NUC cut-after
‘You are changed (STANDING), having shaved off your beard.’ [literally: ‘You are in the vertical state of being changed, having shaved off your beard.’]
elicitation: 2017-08-14

c. Wat‘epotekapšira wat wat‘oyē haet atpe.
wat-epoteka-psira-a wat wat-oyē hap-et at-pe
2PL-change-RSLT:PL-TH 2PL 2PL-mouth hair-NUC cut-after
‘You-PAUC are changed (POSITION UNSPECIFIED), having shaved off your beard.’
[literally: ‘You-PAUC are in the state of being changed, having shaved off your beard.’]
elicitation: 2017-08-14

The variant in (c) is positionally unspecified: plural -psira does not encode any information about whether the subject is horizontal or vertical.

The sensitivity of the resultative to the physical position of the subject means that certain lexical verbs will preferentially combine with either horizontal -psē or vertical -pnē:

(27) Singular resultative matches position encoded by the lexical verb

a. Otomēknā ko ’on.
o-tomēk-nē-a ko ’on
1SG-stand.up-RSLT:SG:VRTCL-TH POLITE.FUTURE 1SG
‘I am going to be standing.’ [literally: ‘I am going to be in the vertical state of having stood up.’]
casual discourse: 2017-08-09

b. Hare ko ’on wepsiksam.
hare ko ’on w-epsik-sē-am
here POLITE.FUTURE 1SG 1SG-sit.down-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-ADV.FOC
‘I am going to be sitting here.’ [literally: ‘I am going to be here in the horizontal state of having sat down.’]
casual discourse: 2018-07-25
Example (a) was how a speaker politely refused my offer of a chair, and (b) was how a speaker declined to get up from where she was already sitting down. The positional distinction encoded in the resultative is reflected in the verbal roots: *tomēk* 'stand up' goes with vertical -*pnē*, *epsik* 'sit down' goes with horizontal -*psē*. Speakers categorically reject swapping the two affixes:

(28) Speakers reject positional mismatches between lexical verb and the resultative

a. * Otomēksā ko 'on.
  o-tomēk-sē-a ko 'on
  1SG-stand.up-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-TH POLITE.FUTURE 1SG
  (intended to mean the same as 27a)
  elicitation: 2018-07-29

b. * Hare ko 'on wepsiknam.
  hare ko 'on w-epsik-nē-am
  here POLITE.FUTURE 1SG 1SG-sit.down-RSLT:SG:VRTCL-ADV.FOC
  (intended to mean the same as 27b)
  elicitation: 2018-07-29

That the plural resultative does not encode information about the subject’s physical position is clear from its ability to combine with *epsik* and *tomēk* alike:

(29) Plural resultative is positionally invariant

a. Kiepsiksira kit.
  ki-epsik-sira-a kit
  1PL:INCL-sit.down-RSLT:PL-TH POLITE.FUTURE:1DUAL:INCL
  ‘We-DUAL are going to remain sitting.’ [literally: ‘We-DUAL are going to be in the state of having sat down.’]
  elicitation: 2018-07-29

b. Kitomēksira kit.
  ki-tomēk-sira-a kit
  1PL:INCL-stand.up-RSLT:PL-TH POLITE.FUTURE:1DUAL:INCL
  ‘Let us-DUAL remain standing.’ [literally: ‘We-DUAL are going to be in the state of having stood up.’]
  elicitation: 2018-07-29

The roots *epsik* ‘sit down’ and *tomēk* ‘stand up’ are used only as inceptives or inchoatives; they do not indicate an ongoing physical state (‘be sitting’, ‘be standing’) but rather a change in position. Similarly, the verbal root *anem* in (32a) and (33a) means ‘lie down’, not ‘be lying down.’ The language’s positional auxiliaries, on the other hand, do not encode any information about change of state and to my knowledge do not combine with resultative -*psē/-pnē/-psira*. (See 30b and 38 for examples of the positional auxiliary yē ‘AUXHZNTL-SG’.) Thank you to the reviewer who raised the question of how to best translate verbal roots such as *epsik* and *tomēk*. 

---
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The neutralization of positional contrasts with plural subjects occurs elsewhere in Tupári. For example, in the present progressive singular subjects trigger a horizontal/vertical distinction in the auxiliary; the auxiliaries used with plural subjects, however, have a single, positionally invariant form (Singerman 2018a:196–203).

6.2 Telling the evidential and the resultative apart: four diagnostics

Given the considerable homophony between evidential -pnê/-psira and resultative -psê/-pnê/-psira, we must ask how these morphemes can be distinguished from one another. When a speaker uses -pnê, how does the listener know whether to interpret this morpheme as the singular vertical resultative or as the singular evidential? The same question applies in the case of -psira, which is ambiguous between the plural resultative and the plural evidential.

This subsection discusses four diagnostics that tell the evidential and resultative suffixes apart. First: the resultative can occur with non-past tense marking and in commands, whereas the evidential is restricted to past tense contexts only. Second: the resultative can occur with the full set of clause-typing particles, whereas the evidential is incompatible with nâkop ‘maybe’ and mâkêrô ‘dunno’. Third: the resultative can occur inside of non-finite constructions. Fourth: the evidential frequently combines with the negative suffix -‘om, but the resultative cannot do so.

6.2.1 Diagnostic #1: The resultative can occur in non-past contexts and commands.

Evidential -pnê/-psira can only be used in past tense contexts, but resultative -psê/-pnê/-psira is not restricted in the same way. The tense morphology is highlighted in (30):

(30) Resultative can combine with past, present, and future morphology

a. Here kômkômêria tepsiksârê.
   here kômkmô-ki-a te-epsik-sê-a-n e
   then silence-VBZ-TH 3C-sit.down-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-TH-NEAR.PAST 3
   ‘And it [the baboon] sat, in silence.’
   text: Isaias Tairimá Tupari, author

b. Wapsikatsâ oyâ o’apteka.
   w-apsikat-sê-a o-yê-a o-‘apteka
   ‘I regularly think about it, sitting down.’
   casual discourse: 2018-08-09

c. Oteyare nâ ètat’epsiksêrô pe’ap.
   oteyare nà e-etat-epsik-sê-ro pe’ap
   by.our.side FOCUS 2SG-just-sit.down-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-NMZ FUTURE.2SG
   ‘You will just sit / be in the state of having sat down by our-EXCL side.’
   casual discourse: 2018-07-27
As these utterances show, resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira can occur with past, present and future morphology. See also examples (27) and (29), above, for the cooccurrence of -psē/-pnē/-psira with the polite future particles located in second position.

The evidential never occurs in imperatives, but the resultative can do so without issue. The command in (31a) was how a mother instructed a noisy child to keep quiet. The child was sitting down at the time, which is why horizontal -psē rather than vertical -pnē was employed. The elicited variants in (b) and (c) complete the paradigm.

(31) Resultative can occur in imperatives

a. Kòmkòmkipsē!
kòmkòm-ki-psē
silence-VBZ-RSLT:SG:HZNTRL
‘Stay quiet!’ (singular addressee, SITTING)
casual discourse: 2016-11-16

b. Kòmkòmkipnē!
kòmkòm-ki-pnē
silence-VBZ-RSLT:SG:VRTCL
‘Stay quiet!’ (singular addressee, STANDING)
elicitation: 2016-12-09

c. Kòmkòmkipsira wat!
kòmkòm-ki-psira wat
silence-VBZ-RSLT:PL 2PL
‘Stay quiet!’ (multiple addressees, POSITION UNSPECIFIED)
elicitation: 2016-12-09

Just as in (29), above, the plural resultative in (31c) encodes no positional information.

6.2.2 Diagnostic #2: The resultative can occur with all clause-typing particles.

Section 4 showed that nākop ‘maybe’ and mākērō ‘dunno’ neutralize the witnessed/non-witnessed evidential contrast. Yet unlike evidential -pnē/-psira, resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira can combine with these two clause-typing particles. (32) demonstrates:

(32) Resultative occurring with clause-typing particles that neutralize evidential contrast

a. CONTEXT: A speaker speculates that his elderly mother may be laying down at home.
   
   Teanemsā
   te-anem-šē-a
   3C-lie.down-RSLT:SG:HZNTRL-TH maybe 3
   nākop.
   ‘She may be lying down / may be in the horizontal state of having lain down.’
casual discourse: 2017-08-?20
b. **CONTEXT:** A speaker is surprised by some bumps that have appeared on her leg.

\[kat’at \text{ mäkëro} \text{ tey’ao} \text{sir-a-t} \]
\[kat’at \text{ mäkëro} \oplus \text{ te-ey’ao} \text{ sir-a-t} \]

what dunno 3 3C-emerge.PL-\text{RSLT:PL-TH-NUC}

‘I don’t know what things have emerged / are in the state of having emerged.’

casual discourse: 2017-07-28

Unsurprisingly, \text{-psë/-pnë/-psira} can also occur with those clause-typing particles that do not trigger any evidential neutralization. Example (36a), in Section 6.2.4, shows the resultative suffix in combination with \text{në ‘yes/no’}.

### 6.2.3 Diagnostic #3: The resultative can occur in non-finite environments.

Resultative \text{-psë/-pnë/-psira} can occur in non-finite constructions that are incapable of containing evidential morphology. (33) shows the resultative inside of the deverbal nominalizer \text{-ap}:

(33) **Resultative in within non-finite nominalizations with \text{-ap}**

a. \text{Sayparet teanemsam \text{hi’a.}}
\[saypare-t \text{ te-anem-së-am} \text{ hi’a} \]
\[deer-NUC 3 \text{C-lie.down-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-NMZ } \text{like} \]

‘Deer like to be in the horizontal state of having lain down.’

casual discourse: 2016-11-29

b. \text{Irik’enammë yamsikia kitomëknaen.}
\[irik’enë-am \text{ e y-amsiki-a ki-tomëk-në-am-en} \]
\[work-NMZ 3 \text{3-untie-TH one-stand.up-RSLT:SG:VRTCL-NMZ-NUC } \]

‘One must work to untie it [a hammock] when in the vertical state of having stood up.’

casual discourse: 2018-08-06

In (a), the nominalized VP \text{teanemsam} is the possessor of \text{hi’a ‘like, love, affection’}; in (b), the nominalized VP \text{yamsikia kitomëknaen} serves as the sentential subject and thus bears the nuclear case.

(34) provides examples of the resultative in non-finite adverbial clauses. In (a) \text{-psë} occurs inside of the adverbial suffix \text{-ro’are ‘while, once’}. The speaker of this utterance was referring to a house then under construction. Houses on the Rio Branco Reserve are one-story, so they are conceptualized as sitting rather than standing; this is why the speaker used horizontal \text{-psë}. In (b) \text{-psë} occurs inside of the purposive subordinator \text{-tenë}, which requires its complement to bear the same nominalizing suffix, \text{-ap}, that was seen in (33).
Resultative in non-finite adverbial clauses

a. Éy e-s pe’eronam ekget
e-3SG-come:SG FUTURE.2SG+again [ house-NUC
tepoatkatse-tö’are.
tepoatkat-së-ro’are
3C-be.finished-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-once ]
‘You will come back here again once the house is done / is in the horizontal state of
having been finished.’
casual discourse: 2016-12-09

b. Waet āpea ko ‘on o’era
wap-et āpe-a ko ’on o’et-a
hammock-NUC hang-TH POLITE.FUTURE 1SG [ 1SG-sleep-TH
omam-samtenä.
omamsamten-a
1SG-place-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-NMZ-PURP ]
‘Let me hang up my hammock in order for me to sleep, in the horizontal state of having
placed myself [within the hammock].’
casual discourse: 2015-10-11

Evidential -pnë/-psira occurs in fully finite clauses only; it never appears in the kind of non-finite
constructions given in (33) and (34).

6.2.4 Diagnostic #4: The resultative cannot combine with the negative suffix -’om.
The negative suffix -’om occupies a singularly low position in the Tuparí clause: it sits underneath
all aspectual projections, the Evidential Phrase, and the Tense Phrase (Singerman 2018b). As a
result -’om always scopes underneath evidential -pnë/-psira, as demonstrated by (35a) and (35b).

(35) Evidential -pnë/-psira scopes above negative -’om

a. CONTEXT: A mother explains that her youngest son failed to go to school that morning:
he slept in and missed the bus. Because the mother was herself asleep when her son
missed the bus, she did not witness his failure to go to school.
Omemsiret tero’omkapnä.
omemsiret tero’om-ka-pne-a
1SG-child.of.woman-NUC go:SG-NMZ-NEG-VBZ-EVID:SG-TH
‘My child didn’t go (NON-WITNESSED).’
casual discourse: 2017-08-17
b. CONTEXT: My friend is waiting for me to arrive at his home in the town of Alta Floresta D’Oeste. I forget to ask the bus driver to let me off at an intersection near my friend’s home; I only get off the bus at the somewhat distant bus terminal. My friend was not present to see the bus pass by his house.

Ek  yare 'en ekopto'omkapnam.
ek  yare 'en e-kop-to-'om-ka-pnē-am
house by 2SG 2SG-get.down-NMZ-NEG-VBZ-EVID:SG-ADV.FOC
‘You didn’t get down [from the bus] by the house (NON-WITNESSED).’
casual discourse: 2018-08-31

In both (a) and (b) negative -’om sits closer to the verbal root than does evidential -pnē/-psira. This difference in position matches how the evidential is interpreted above negation.

Interestingly, it is not possible to combine resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira with negative -’om. The only acceptable answer to the question in (36a), which contains singular horizontal -psē, is (36b) – without the resultative.

(36) Resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira cannot combine with -’om ‘NEG’

a. Emamsā nē ’en?
  e-mā-msē-a nē ’en
2SG-place-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-TH yes/no 2SG
‘Have you placed yourself [in the hammock]?’ / ‘Are you in the horizontal state of having placed yourself [in the hammock]?’
casual discourse: 2018-08-09

b. Omarō’om ’on.
o-mā-ro-’om ’on
1SG-place-NMZ-NEG 1SG
‘I have not placed myself.’
elicitation: 2018-08-16

c. * Omarō’om *
o-mā-msē-ro-’om ’on
1SG-place-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-NMZ-NEG 1SG
(intended to mean the same as 36b)
elicitation: 2018-08-16

d. * Omarō’omkapsā ’on.
o-mā-ro-’om-ka-psē-a ’on
1SG-place-NMZ-NEG-VBZ-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-TH 1SG
(intended to mean the same as 36b)
elicitation: 2018-08-28
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There exists a semantic motivation for the incompatibility between -psē/-pnē/-psira and -'om. Although resultative verbal forms ‘express a state implying a previous event’ (Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988:6), the negation of this meaning is not the negation of the state itself. Rather, it is the negation of the event that led to the state in the first place (Nedjalkov 2001:935; see also Givón 1978 and Horn 1989 for foundational work on semantic and pragmatic asymmetries related to negation). This fact explains why (36b) – which lacks the resultative suffix – is preferred over (36c) and (36d) as a negative answer to (36a).

6.3 Synchronic and diachronic connections between the resultative and evidential suffixes

The four diagnostics in Section 6.2 prove that resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira and evidential -pnē/-psira behave very differently despite their partial homophony. Translating the findings of these diagnostics into phrase structure gives the tree in Figure 2. Here the Evidential Phrase occurs immediately underneath the Tense Phrase, in the inflectional layer of the clause, while the projection headed by -psē/-pnē/-psira occurs just above the VP/vP, in the region where thematic roles are assigned and argument structure is manipulated. ResultativeP and EvidP are thus positioned on opposite ends of the auxiliary projections AUXGO / AuxpositionalP and AuxhabitualP. That a single utterance is unlikely to have all of this functional material overtly realized is not important; the crucial point is instead that the resultative surfaces on the lexical verb even when an auxiliary is present, whereas the evidential always sits on the highest verbal head (which may or may not be an auxiliary). The difference in height between the two bolded projections in Figure 2 captures the distinct linear positions of resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira, on the one hand, and evidential -pnē/-psira, on the other. What the Evidential and Resultative heads share despite their different heights is agreement in number with the subject, which I assume is base-generated within the VP (Koopman and Sportiche 1991 and much subsequent work).

The proposal in Figure 2 makes several correct predictions. First, it predicts that resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira should sit closer to the verb than evidential -pnē/-psira when both suffixes occur in a single clause. Such cooccurrences are attested in spontaneous discourse:

(37) Waptsitwatsemnā 'on.
w-apsitwat-sē-mnē-a 'on
1SG-forget-RSLT:SG:HZNTL-EVID:SG-TH 1SG
'I am in the horizontal state of having forgotten (NON-WITNESSED).'
casual discourse: 2017-08-02

In frameworks where morphology and syntax work in tandem (Baker 1985), the fact that the resultative sits closer to the verbal root than the evidential does means that ResultativeP is lower than EvidP. This difference in syntactic height is also illustrated by the position of the two auxiliaries in
Figure 2: The respective positions of ResultativeP and EvidP in the Tupari clause
In that example horizontal -psē attaches to the lexical verb *apsikat* ‘think about’, to the left of the horizontal auxiliary *yē* and the present habitual auxiliary *'apteka*. Yet as discussed in Section 3, the evidential suffix always attaches to the rightmost auxiliary. This difference indicates that the resultative and the evidential occupy distinct positions in the clause, as in Figure 2.

Figure 3: ResultativeP and EvidP differ with regards to non-finite subordination

![Diagram](image)

That resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira can occur in non-finite environments is also predicted by the clause structure proposed here. Non-finite constructions in Tuparí may only include as much material as an Auxhabitual Phrase, as shown in Figure 3. Since ResultativeP sits underneath the auxiliary projections, it follows that non-finite nominalizations that contain auxiliaries can include resultative morphology as well. (38) shows a purposive clause that contains auxiliaries known to occupy positions higher than ResultativeP but lower than EvidP: horizontal *yē* and habitual *'eka*.

(38) **CONTEXT**: A friend explains why he wants a recording of English words and phrases.

Wapsi’a  
*oyā*  
*ő’ekaptenā.*

w-apsi’e-a  
*o-yē-a*  
*o-’eka-ap-tenā*

1SG-listen-TH 1SG-AUXhzmtl-SG-TH 1SG-AUXhabit:SG-NMZ-PURP

‘In order for me to listen to it regularly, sitting down / lying down.’

casual discourse: 2018-08-06

Example 34b (Section 6.2.3) includes a purposive clause that contains the resultative: *o’era omamsamtenā* ‘in order for me to sleep, in the horizontal state of having placed myself [within the hammock]’. Since ResultativeP is lower than the auxiliary phrases – and since these in turn are lower than EvidP – the ability of resultative but not evidential morphology to appear in non-finite environments follows from Figures 2 and 3.

Note that it is not possible to conflate the projection headed by resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira with the projection headed by the positional auxiliary *yē*. This is because a single clause can contain
both the resultative and yê – see (30b), in Section 6.2.1. That utterance shows that ResultativeP is distinct from (and lower than) AuxpositionalP, even though the heads of the two projections can contribute overlapping positional information.

To my knowledge no affixes comparable to evidential -pnê/-psira or resultative -psê/-pnê/-psira have been described for the other members of the Tuparian branch of Tupian. It could be that such affixes do exist but have not yet been discovered; alternatively, Tuparí may be truly unique in its genealogical context. Although we lack comparative data that could explain how evidential -pnê/-psira and resultative -psê/-pnê/-psira developed, the tool of internal reconstruction (see, among others, Givón 2000 and Campbell 2013: chapter eight) does permit us to hypothesize a process of change that led to the present state. It is likely that the evidential and the resultative share a common origin, given their homophony outside of -psê. More specifically, EvidP must have developed out of ResultativeP via syntactic reanalysis: what began as a low affix marking a non-obligatory category ascended within the language’s hierarchy of functional projections, ultimately coming to occupy a position in the inflectional rather than thematic layer of the clause.13 This reanalysis would have required information about the current state of an object (‘the snake is in the state of having died’) to be reinterpreted as information about the process or action that led to that state (‘the snake died [NON-WITNESSED]’). This is a straightforward reinterpretation given the nature of the language’s witnessed/non-witnessed contrast. For a speaker to treat a past tense occurrence as witnessed, it is not enough for her to have after-the-fact visual evidence that it took place; she needed to see it happen. This is why the speaker of (17) utilized -pnê/-psira when referring to the dead snake by the riverbank. The snake’s body provided clear evidence that a killing event had transpired. Yet as the speaker had not seen that killing event take place, she had to mark her utterance as non-witnessed. That after-the-fact visual evidence does not license Tuparí speakers to treat past tense occurrences as witnessed provides language-internal support for the diachronic change proposed here.

The suffix -psê/-pnê/-psira qualifies as a resultative in the sense of Nedjalkov and Jaxontov (1988) because it means that an action has taken place such that a new state now holds: hence pap ‘die’ becomes papsê ‘be in the horizontal state of having [already] died’, tomêk ‘stand up’ becomes tomêknê ‘be in the vertical state of having [already] stood up’, and so on. As a reviewer points out, such resultatives also mark perfect aspect in Klein’s (1994) framework: the action in question has necessarily been completed by Topic Time (see also Ritz 2012). The literature on the diachrony of evidentiality contains many examples of perfect or resultative morphology developing into non-witnessed/inferential evidentials. This development has taken place in multiple Balkan languages, in part due to the influence of Ottoman Turkish (Friedman 1986, 2000, 2003). It has also taken

13See Roberts and Roussou (1999, 2003) on the idea that grammaticalization involves this kind of syntactic ascen-
place in several non-Indo-European families of Eurasia: see Malchukov (2000) on the Tungusic family, Tatevosov (2001), Belyaev (2018) and Multatov (2018) on Nakh-Daghestanian languages, and Jalava (2014, 2017) on Tundra Nenets (of the Samoyedic branch of Uralic). My proposal that the positional resultative \(-ps\~e/-pn\~e/-psira\) grammaticalized into the non-witnessed evidential \(-pn\~e/-psira\) thus enjoys crosslinguistic precedent: such a reanalysis is consistent with diachronic changes known to have taken place in many Eurasian families (Friedman 2018 and references therein).

One final question remains: if evidential \(-pn\~e/-psira\) developed out of resultative \(-ps\~e/-pn\~e/-psira\), why doesn’t it express physical position as well? There are several possible answers. First, the resultative may not have drawn a positional distinction at the point in time when evidential \(-pn\~e/-psira\) grammaticalized. It is plausible that the ancestor of modern \(-ps\~e/-pn\~e/-psira\) may have expressed only the core resultative meaning; the contrast between horizontal \(-ps\~e\) and vertical \(-pn\~e\) would have arisen only after evidential \(-pn\~e/-psira\) developed into a synchronically distinct affix. Alternatively, since evidential \(-pn\~e/-psira\) is used only to describe events that one did not see – and since it is difficult to specify the physical position of participants in a non-witnessed event – the resultative’s positional contrast may have been neutralized on semantic grounds when the evidential suffix grammaticalized.

There may also be a synchronic structural explanation for the lack of a positional contrast in evidential \(-pn\~e/-psira\).\(^{14}\) This suffix combines with all kinds of predicates: telic and atelic, eventive and non-eventive. The grammatical category that it instantiates operates independently of the semantics of the lexical verb. Resultative \(-ps\~e/-pn\~e/-psira\), on the other hand, is exquisitely sensitive to the meaning of the lexical verb. It only attaches to inceptives or inchoatives; what is more, with singular subjects there must be concordance in terms of physical position. This difference between the evidential and resultative suffixes can be accounted for phrase structurally. On Figures 2 and 3 the Resultative head directly selects for the lexical verb, which is to say that it can impose idiosyncratic requirements – including physical position – on its complement. The Evidential head, on the other hand, is far higher in the structure; it cannot interact selectionally with the lexical verb. If the positional concordance between resultative \(-pn\~e/-psira\) and the lexical verb is accomplished via syntactic selection, then it follows that evidential \(-pn\~e/-psira\) is structurally too far away from the verb to mark position.

7 Conclusion

This article has shown that Tupará makes a systematic witnessed versus non-witnessed evidential distinction, subject to certain restrictions of tense and clause type. Despite these restrictions, evidentiality is a pervasive aspect of Tupará grammar and discourse. In stretches of speech that relate

\(^{14}\)Thank you to Ksenia Ershova and Michelle Yuan for discussion of these ideas.
actions not witnessed by the speaker, -pnē/-psira appears in each and every finite clause – see (6), above, for a representative textual example. Semantically, using -pnē/-psira presumes commitment on the part of the deictic origo to the veracity or reliability of the proposition p. This analysis explains the inability of -pnē/-psira to occur with the clause-typing particles nākop ‘maybe’ and mākērō ‘dunno’, as well as its projective behavior in finite embedded clauses. It further accounts for the ability of -pnē/-psira to appear in the presupposed complements of factives like puop’omnā ‘not know’. Finally, I have argued that that resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira and evidential -pnē/-psira share a common historical origin despite their synchronic structural differences. The diachronic development proposed here is that information originally expressed with the resultative was reinterpreted as a non-witnessed statement about a past occurrence. Given that the aspectual contribution of resultative -psē/-pnē/-psira is that of a perfect, Tupari conforms to the well-known tendency for markers of perfect aspect to diachronically change into non-witnessed or inferential evidentials.

Tupari -pnē/-psira meets the core criteria expected of evidentials on the approaches of Aikhenvald (2018) or Brugman and Macaulay (2015). It is a bound morpheme whose height in the syntactic spine is absolutely fixed. Semantically it indicates that the speaker did not personally witness the occurrence or action that they are relating; that is, it contributes a non-witnessed semantics. What is more, -pnē/-psira possesses several characteristics which correspond to the grammatical rather than lexical end of the grammar-vocabulary spectrum. It instantiates a category that must be marked on the clausal level; partakes in nuanced relationships with tense and clause type; and occupies a position within the inflectional rather than thematic layer of the clause. It is worth emphasizing that if one were to adopt a definition of evidential morphology more restrictive than Aikhenvald’s or Brugman and Macaulay’s – for instance, if one were to consider obligatoriness and deictic orientation to be criterial – then -pnē/-psira would still qualify. The witnessed/non-witnessed distinction marked by -pnē/-psira is as obligatory as tense is in all past declaratives. Furthermore, the deictic orientation of this distinction is always determined by the kind of clause at hand: the origo remains anchored to the speaker in declaratives and biased polar questions, but flips to the addressee in polar questions containing nē ‘yes/no’ or nāpe ‘emphatic’ and in content questions that lack an overt clause-typing particle.

As mentioned in the introduction, most of the Tupían languages that mark evidentiality do so through predicate- or clause-peripheral particles; the obligatoriness of these particles varies from language to language. The synchronic analysis and diachronic proposal that I have put forth in this paper would benefit from information concerning evidentiality in Tupari’s closest relatives within the Tupían family and in the non-Tupían languages with which Tupari has historically been in contact. All of the other members of the Tuparían branch of Tupían – Makurap, Wayoro, Sakurabiá, Akuntsú – are endangered; none enjoy stable intergenerational transmission (Galucio 2001; Braga 2005; Galucio and Nogueira 2011; Moore 2011; Nogueira 2011; Aragon 2014). Several non-
Tuparín languages from the Rio Branco region are highly endangered, as well; the Macro-Jê language Arikapú, for instance, has only one fluent speaker left (Arikapú et al. 2010; Ribeiro and van der Voort 2010). Detailed documentation of how evidentiality works in these and other native languages of Rondônia is urgently needed.

A  Evidentiality, negation, and first person effects

Combining evidential -pnê/-psira with first person subjects gives rise to an interpretation of unintentional or accidental behavior (see Curnow 2002, 2003 for a cross-linguistic typology). Such interpretations make intuitive sense given that first person subjects prototypically witness the events that they carry out, whereas evidential marking violates that expectation. (39) illustrates:

(39) Interpretations of accidental or non-volitional behavior with first person subjects

a. CONTEXT: My friend is looking for kōatek ‘palm larva’ in the trunk of a fallen tree, using a large knife to cut away the rotted pulp. She realizes that she has cut in half a kōatek that was inside of the pulp. As she did not kill the kōatek intentionally – indeed, she didn’t even know it was there – she uses -pnê ‘EVID:SG’.

Yôpopnâ 'on.
y-ôpo-pnê-a 'on
3-kill-EVID:SG-TH 1SG

‘I killed it (BY ACCIDENT).’
casual discourse: 2018-08-27

b. CONTEXT: A friend of mine brews a pot of coffee. After serving the coffee, she tastes it and discovers that it has come out too sweet. Though she intentionally brewed the coffee, making the coffee excessively sweet was accidental; so she uses -pnê, too.

Hoy’aenâ ‘on nemnam.
 hoy’aenâ 'on ò-nè-mnê-am
too sweet 1SG 3-make-EVID:SG-ADV.FOC

‘I made it too sweet (BY ACCIDENT).’
casual discourse: 2017-08-05

A clear example of first person effects with evidential morphology comes from the durative tense suffix -pbi’a, which never cooccurs with -pnê/-psira. In declaratives -pbi’a is felicitous only if the speaker personally witnessed (at least some iterations of) the past habitual action being described. In (40a) a woman asserts that a deceased non-indigenous man had learned the Tuparí language. Since she knew the man in question and had seen him speak Tuparí, she uses durative -pbi’a. Yet if she wished to comment on the linguistic competence of someone she had never met,
she would need to use the periphrastic alternative in (b): -\textit{pbi’}a disappears, the distant past particle \textit{opot} occurs in second position, and the habitual auxiliary ’\textit{eka} hosts -\textit{pně}.

(40) **Durative -pbi’\textit{a} equals WITNESSED in declaratives**

\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] \textit{Puopnambi’ae} \textit{Tupari ema’erē.}
\textit{puop-nē-a-}\textit{-mbi’}a \textit{e Tupari ema’ē-re}
know-VBZ-TH-DUR 3 Tuparí language-OBL

‘He knew the Tuparí language (WITNESSED).’
casual discourse: 2015-10-08

\item[b.] \textit{Puopn\textit{a}} \textit{opot i’ekapně} \textit{Tupari ema’erē.}
\textit{puop-nē-a} \textit{-opot i-’eka-pně} \textit{Tupari ema’ē-re}
know-VBZ-TH DISTANT-PAST 3-AUXhabit:SG:EVID:SG Tuparí language-OBL

‘He knew the Tuparí language (NON-WITNESSED).’
elicitiation: 2015-10-10
\end{itemize}

Interestingly, durative -\textit{pbi’}a cannot be used when speakers express their own ignorance. If a speaker says (41a) – where -\textit{pbi’}a combines with \textit{puop’omn\textit{a}} ‘not know’ – this can only mean that she was aware of her ongoing failure to know something. (One possible context: if in her childhood the speaker frequently heard people speaking Makurap but could not understand them, then she ‘saw’ her own ignorance of their language.) The durative is however unacceptable if a speaker has just learned a new piece of information, for prior to learning that piece of information she cannot have been a witness to her own ignorance. In this context the kind of periphrasis shown in (40b) returns: the durative disappears and an auxiliary hosts evidential -\textit{pně}. Note that (41b) is identical in all relevant respects to the matrix clause in (25), discussed at the end of Section 5.

(41) **Durative -pbi’\textit{a} cannot be used to express ignorance on the speaker’s part**

\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] \textit{Puop’omnambi’\textit{a}} \textit{‘on.}
\textit{puop-’om-nē-a-}\textit{-mbi’}a \textit{‘on}
know-NEG-VBZ-TH-DUR 1SG

‘I was ignorant / I did not know (WITNESSED).’
elicitiation: 2015-10-10

\item[b.] \textit{Puop’omn\textit{a}} \textit{‘on nā ote’epně} \textit{đren.}
\textit{puop-’om-nē-a} \textit{‘on nā o-tet’e-pně} \textit{on-en}
know-NEG-VBZ-TH 1SG FOCUS 1SG-AUXGO:SG:EVID:SG 1SG-NUC

‘I was ignorant / I did not know (NON-WITNESSED).’
casual discourse: 2016-12-14
\end{itemize}

Example (b) must contain evidential -\textit{pně} because the speaker was ignorant of her own ignorance. In the same way, -\textit{pně} is required in (37) (Section 6.3) because the speaker of that utterance had
unintentionally forgotten the piece of information he wished to recall.\textsuperscript{15}

We have now seen several examples in which a first person subject carried out or participated in an action without knowingly doing so. When negative morphology is added to the mix, the interpretation is that of accidentally neglecting to carry out an action:

(42) a. CONTEXT: While walking through her wirik ‘field’, my friend realizes that she left her new pack of watermelon seeds back at her house.

\begin{verbatim}
Saromkapnā  'on!
s-at-ro-'om-ka-\textit{pnē}-a  'on
3-grab-NMZ-NEG-VBZ-EVID:SG-TH 1SG
'I didn’t grab it (BY ACCIDENT)!' casual discourse: 2018-08-27
\end{verbatim}

b. CONTEXT: While waiting for a ride from the village of São Luís to the village of Serrinha, I run into a friend from Serrinha. He leaves his wheelbarrow in São Luís since he is going to return to his home via motorbike. When I see him later that night in Serrinha, he realizes that he missed the opportunity to ask me to bring his wheelbarrow with me: since I hitched a ride in a pickup truck, there would have been enough room for the wheelbarrow.

\begin{verbatim}
Adāo, èsa  e'a  ke  'en okahiola
Adāo  e-s-a  e-'a  ke  'en o-\textit{kahiola}
Adam  [ 2SG-come:SG-TH 2SG-if SG POLITE: FUTURE 2SG 1SG-wheelbarrow
etēy  kero'omkapnā  'on.
ete-s  ke-ro-'om-ka-\textit{pnē}-a  'on.
‘Adam, I didn’t even say (BY ACCIDENT) for you to bring my wheelbarrow with you.’
/ ‘I didn’t even say (BY ACCIDENT) ‘please bring my wheelbarrow when you come.”
casual discourse: 2018-08-22
\end{verbatim}

Beyond the suffix -‘om in (42) (see also Section 6.2.4), Tuparí has an alternative negation strategy in the clause-typing particle ‘aet∼et ‘it’s a shame that not p’. This the only clause-typing particle not discussed in Section 4. Using ‘aet signals disappointment, frustration or annoyance on the speaker’s part (Singerman 2018b:445–47; see also Galucio 2014 and Overall 2017 on frustratives in Amazonia).

\textsuperscript{15}The same-day past construction behaves identically to -pbi‘a in terms of the evidential contrast: it cannot combine with -pnē/-psira and is therefore interpreted as WITNESSED in declarative clauses (Singerman 2018a:197–199).
Examples with ‘aet ‘it’s a shame that not p’

a. CONTEXT: A friend and I are walking at night in Alta Floresta D’Oeste. It is dark and many cars are speeding by. I encourage her to walk quickly; this is how she replies.

Wararo oterope, kaho ‘aet ‘on.
wararo o-tet-rope kaho ‘aet ‘on
quickly 1SG-go:SG-PURP car shame.that.not.p 1SG

‘I am not a car, so as to go quickly.’ / ‘It is a shame that I am not a car, so as to go quickly.’
casual discourse: 2017-09-02

b. CONTEXT: When I tell a friend that I will be going back and forth between Alta Floresta and Ji-Paraná over the next two days, she laments the fact that I travel so much.

Eạt’āum’atāumka et nā etete.
e-atāum’atāum-ka-a (’a)et nā e-tete
2SG-stay2-VBZ-TH shame.that.not.p PROG 2SG-AUXGO:SG

‘You don’t ever stay put.’ / ‘It’s a shame that you don’t ever stay put.’
casual discourse: 2016-12-17

It is possible for ‘aet to combine with evidential -pnē/-psira, too. In all such examples in my corpus, the subject is first person:

Examples where ‘aet combines with -pnē/-psira and a first person subject

a. CONTEXT: When I return to the village of Serrinha from a brief trip to Alta Floresta D’Oeste, my friend laments not having sent along cash for me to buy a chicken.

Korakora ‘epsi mākνan ‘aet ‘on Adāo yope!
korakora ‘epsi māk-nē-a-n ‘aet ‘on Adāo yope
chicken money send-EVID:SG-TH-NEAR.PAST shame.that.not.p 1SG Adam with

‘I didn’t even send money for a chicken with Adam (BY ACCIDENT)!’
casual discourse: 2018-08-23

b. CONTEXT: Some friends travel to the city to participate in a church event. Upon returning home, they realize that they forgot to purchase juice in town.

Kiapsitkarap ket’ekapsira ‘aet ‘okit
ki-apsitkat-ap ket’eka-psira-a ‘aet ‘okit
1PL:INCL-think-NMZ do.somewhat-EVID:PL-TH shame.that.not.p 1DUAL.INCL
herōwap suko pekaere!
herōwap suko pek-ap-ere
yesterday juice buy-NMZ-OBL

‘We didn’t even think to buy juice yesterday (BY ACCIDENT)!’
casual discourse: 2018-08-27
The woman who spoke (44b) subsequently confirmed that -'om can replace 'aet here:

(45)  

Kiapsitkaro'omkapsira  
ki-apsitkat-ro-'om-ka-psira-a  
1PL:INCL-think-NMZ-NEG-VBZ-EVID:PL-TH  

'okia'omkapsira-a  
okiaherōwap!  

herōwap  

1DUAL.INCL yesterday  

'same as 44b'  
elicitation: 2018-08-28

The truth conditional or pragmatic differences between (44b) (with 'aet) and (45) (with -'om) are not fully understood at present. Importantly, I do not know of any scopal differences between the two variants. In both utterances the evidential scopes over the negative morphology; that is, the fact that the speaker did not witness the failure to buy juice is not negated. So 'aet and -'om are both interpreted beneath evidential -pnē/-psira.
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