



### 3.1 Local configurations: interaction between speech act participants (SAPs; 1↔2)

- Harakmbut shows considerable **pragmatic skewing** in 1↔2 pronominal combinations, corresponding to the cross-linguistically attested tendency to avoid transparent 1↔2 combinations, which are pragmatically sensitive (cf. Heath 1991 on Australian lgs; 1998 on native American lgs)

#### (a) Indicative and dubitative mood (basic system) (Tables 2 and 3)

- indicative vs. dubitative mood is marked by the presence or absence of suffixes; shared prefix slots
- 1↔2 combinations are expressed by unanalysable portmanteaus: 1↔2SG vs. 1↔2PL (so, just 2 forms for 8 combinations)  
(strategy 6 in Heath 1998, cf. Caddo, Lakhota, Coos, Klamath, Acoma, Zoque of Copainalá)
- neutralization of number marking of 1<sup>st</sup> person in 1→2 and 2→1  
(strategy 4 in Heath 1998; in Kalispel neutralization of number marking of 2<sup>nd</sup> person, Vogt 1940: 25-26)
- homophony/syncretism of the 1↔2SG form with 1PL(→3) inclusive IND form (prefix + suffix)  
(strategy 8 in Heath 1998, cf. Southern Sierra Miwok, Zoque of Francisco León, Carib)
- disambiguation possible through case-marked free pronouns, cf. Table 1

Person/number	Root form	NOM	ACC
1SG	ndo	ndo-a	ndo-ta
1PL (incl/excl)	oro'	oro'-a	oro-ta
2SG	on	on-a	on-ta
2PL	opudn	opudn-a	opudn-ta
3SG/PL	ken	ken-a	ken-ta

Table 1: Case-marked free pronouns (cf. also Helberg 1984; Tripp 1995)

- (3) On **o-ning-to-chak-me-ne** purak  
 2SG 1↔2SG-BEN-SOC-come-REC.DIR.EVD-IND cacique  
 'You (sg) brought me a cacique (type of passerine bird).' [elicitation on personal pronouns]
- (4) Kate-apo **o'-pak-Ø?**  
 What-REAS 1↔2SG-want-DUB  
 'Why do I love you (sg)?' [elicitation on interrogatives]
- (5) Meneng-a **o-chokkawe-me-Ø?**  
 how.many-times 1↔2SG-forget-REC.DIR.EVD-DUB  
 'how many times have you (sg) forgotten me?' [elicitation on interrogatives]  
 Equally possible: 'how many times have I forgotten you (sg)?'  
 'how many times have we forgotten you (sg)?'  
 'how many times have you (sg) forgotten us?'

#### (b) Imperative mood: different subsystem concerning {2, 3} →1 within basic system (Table 4)

- person neutralization of A-arguments in prefix slot (2→1 = 3→1)  
(strategy 5 in Heath 1998, cf. Biloxi, Karuk, Zoque of Francisco León)
- however, ambiguity of the A-argument is resolved by the markers in the suffix slot (1: -i/-y; 2: Ø; 3:-e), compare (6) with (8)
- neutralization of number marking of A-arguments for 2→1PL and 3→1PL (homophony), cf. (7)  
 ➔ also pragmatic skewing in 1↔2 combinations, but 2=3→1 in prefix slot as a different strategy for the imperative mood (yet more transparency than IND and DUB system)

- (6) **mbe-chaway-Ø!**  
 2/3SG→1SG-see-2.IMP  
 'Look at me!' [elicitation on imperatives]
- (7) **Mbo'-yok-Ø** siro!  
 2/3→1.IMP-give-2.IMP machete  
 'Give us the machete!' (addressee: 2SG or 2PL) [elicitation on imperatives]
- (8) **Mbe'-yok-e'** tare  
 2/3SG→1SG-give-3.IMP manioc  
 'He should give me manioc!' [elicitation on imperatives]

### 3.2 Mixed configurations (3↔ {1, 2})

#### (a) Indicative and dubitative mood (basic system) (Tables 2 and 3)

- {1, 2} → 3: only subject is encoded, marked for person & number; A-markers = S-markers
- 1SG > {1PL, 2} hierarchy: 1SG object gets distinct prefixes with all person subject categories
- Also obscuring of referential transparency:
  - o 3 → {1, 2}: portmanteau forms cross-referencing subject and (primary) object
  - o 3 → {1, 2}: number neutralization of A-arguments with plural O-arguments; person neutralization of plural O-arguments
  - o 3SG → {1, 2}: person neutralization of O-arguments
  - o 2PL → 3 = 3 → 2PL, cf. (9)
  - o disambiguation possible through case-marked free pronouns

(9) menpa ä¹-(ë)-ipot                      mo-n-a-ne  
 how 3.SG.DUB-be-EPIST 3→1/2PL-APPL-say-IND  
 'She is telling us how it would be' [spontaneous dialogue: 'family problems' story (Evans)]  
 [in other contexts: 'She is telling you (pl) how it would be'  
 'You (pl) are telling her/him/them how it would be']

(10) ken-a men-tuk-tuk-me-ne                      ut-anda  
 3-NOM 3PL→1SG-hit-hit-REC.DIR.EVD-IND fierce-INTF  
 'They hit me severely.' [elicitation on personal pronouns]

(11) ɹ¹-pak-me-y                                      apik  
 1SG(→3)-want-REC.DIR.EVD-1.IND sugar.cane  
 'I wanted sugarcane' [elicitation on paradigm of the verb 'want']

(12) Oro kate o¹-pak-Ø?  
 1PL what 1PL(→3)-want-DUB  
 'What do we want?' [elicitation on paradigm of the verb 'want']

#### (b) Imperative mood (Table 4):

- Also obscuring of referential transparency:
  - o 3 → {1, 2}: portmanteau forms cross-referencing subject and (primary) object
  - o 3 → {1PL, 2PL}: number neutralization of A-arguments with plural O-arguments; some degree of person neutralization of plural O-arguments (1PL.O has additional prefix *men-*)
  - o 3SG → {1SG, 2SG}: person neutralization of O-arguments
  - o 1DU(→3).IMP = 2/3→1.IMP-...-2.IMP, cf. (13)
  - o disambiguation possible through case-marked free pronouns

(13) achi nang, inpa mbo¹-ka¹  
 soon mother this.way 1DU(→3).IMP-do  
 'Wait, mom, let (the two of) us do it this way!' [spontaneous dialogue: 'family problems' story]  
 [in other contexts: 'Do me, you all!' (??)  
 'Do us, (you all)! (??)']

### 3.3 Non-local configurations (3↔3) (Tables 2-4):

- In all mood types, only subject is encoded, marked for number (prefix); A-marker = S-marker
- No referential opacity in terms of neutralization of values or portmanteaus
- Optional case marking on (nominal/pronominal) NPs

(14) Kate yand-a ken?  
 What 3PL.DUB-say 3  
 'what are they saying?'

(15) Ka¹-arak-e¹!  
 3SG(→3).IMP-kill-3.IMP  
 'He must kill it/him/her!'

### 3.4 Really portmanteaus? Hypothesis on singular/plural contrast in prefixes

Configuration	singular		plural	
Local	o’-/o-...-ne	1↔2SG-...-IND	on-...-ne	1↔2PL-...-IND
Mixed	mbe(’)-/me(’)-...-ne	3SG→1/2SG-...-IND	men-...-ne	3PL→1SG-...-IND
	o’-...	3SG(→3).IND-	on-/ond-...	3PL(→3).IND-
Non-local	a’/ya’-...	3SG(→3).DUB-...	an/and/yan/yand-...	3PL(→3).DUB-...
	ka’-/ka-...-e	3SG(→3).IMP-...-3.IMP	kan-/kan’-...-e	3PL(→3).IMP-...-3.IMP

Table 5: number contrast in the cross-reference system

- Singular is unmarked option; plural marker: *-n(d)*

### 3.5 Distribution of allomorphs: phonetic conditioning, cf. Table 6

mbe(’)-/me(’)-/më(’)-: 2SG→1SG.IMP or 3SG→1/2SG.IND (cf. also Tripp 1995: 206-215)

- mbe-/mbe’ [oral]: only in completely oral environment
- me-/me’ [nasal co-articulation]: nasal prefixes preceding oral stems; only with nasalized bases
- më-/më’ [fully nasal]: always with nasal vowel stems; nasality spreads to vowel of the preceding prefix

Cross-reference prefix; obligatory	onset second prefix; optional	onset third prefix; optional	onset verbal stem; obligatory	example
	plosive	-	plosive	(16)
mbe-/mbe’	-	-	glide	(17)
	plosive	-	glide	(18)
me-/me’	nasal	-	plosive	(19)
	nasal	-	oral vowel	(20)
	nasal	nasal	plosive	(21)
	plosive	nasal	plosive	(22)
më-/më’	-	-	nasal vowel	(23)
	plosive	-	nasal vowel	(24)

Table 7: Phonetically conditioned distribution of cross-reference allomorphs

#### (a) Examples of mbe-/mbe’

(16) Curaca ndo<sup>1</sup>-ta **mbe**-t̩-ka-ne canoa  
 chief 1SG-ACC 3SG→1/2SG.IND-SOC-make-IND canoe  
 ‘The chief is making a canoe with me (telling me how it has to be made)’

(17) Luis-<sup>a</sup> **mbe**’-wadn-a-ne cocina-yo  
 Luis-NOM 3SG→1/2SG.IND-sit-CAUS-IND kitchen-LOC  
 ‘Luis makes me sit in the kitchen’

(18) Luis **mbe**-t̩-wadn-ne cocina-yo  
 Luis 3SG→1/2SG.IND-APPL-sit-IND kitchen-LOC  
 ‘Luis is sitting with me in the kitchen’

#### (b) Examples of me-/me’

(19) Jonas o-n-a gringo-ta **me**-ning-ka-’ wa-wedn  
 Jonas 3SG(→3).IND-APPL-say foreigner-ACC 2SG→1SG.IMP-BEN-make-2.IMP NMLZ-lie  
 ‘Jonas has a bed made by the foreigner’ (Lit. ‘Jonas says to the foreigner: ‘Make me a bed!’’)

(20) Luis-<sup>a</sup> **me**-n-a-ne ya-wadn cocina-yo  
 Luis-NOM 3SG→1/2SG.IND-APPL-say-IND 2SG(→3).IMP-sit kitchen-LOC  
 ‘Luis tells me to sit down in the kitchen’

(21) Herman o-n-a Bernardo-ta **me**-ning-mba-ka-e’ piyã  
 Herman 3SG(→3).IND-APPL-say Bernardo-ACC 2SG→1SG.IMP-BEN-VPL-make-DUR arrow  
 ‘Herman has arrows made by Bernardo’ (Lit. ‘Herman says to Bernardo: ‘Make arrows for me!’’)

(22) Lupe o-n-a-me Ana-ta **me**-ta-mba-tuk-e’ tare  
 Lupe 3SG(→3).IND-APPL-say-REC.DIR.EVD Ana-ACC 2SG→1SG.IMP-APPL-VPL-plant-DUR manioc  
 ‘Lupe made An plant manioc’ (Lit. ‘Lupe said to An: ‘plant manioc with me!’’)

### (c) Examples of mē-/mē'

(23) Sobra mē'-ë-ne wenpu  
be.left 3SG→1/2SG.IND-be-IND string.bag  
'I have one string bag left'

(24) sobra mē-tä-ë-në nongchi-henpu-nda  
be.left 3SG→1/2SG.IND-APPL-be-IND one-string.bag-INTF  
'I have one string bag left'

### 4. Conclusions

- Non-local configurations: no more referential obscurity than in many other languages; only A/S is marked (cross-linguistically recurrent); clues from semantics of the verb & optional case-marking on NPs
- In local configurations, all three mood types (IND, DUB, IMP) show considerable referential obscurity, although different strategies are used (IND & DUB vs. IMP)  
→ pragmatic skewing: transparency is avoided for pragmatic reasons (e.g. politeness) (Heath 1998)
- However, mixed configurations also show some degree of referential obscurity in all mood types (cross-linguistic parallels?); clues from semantics of the verb & optional case-marking on NPs  
→ can this referential opacity still be regarded as a form of pragmatic skewing? Or do we rather have to conclude that Harakmbut hardly tolerates referential transparency with regard to SAPs in any configuration, especially not when A or P (or both) are plural?

### Abbreviations

1	1 <sup>st</sup> person	INCL	inclusive
2	2 <sup>nd</sup> person	IND	indicative
3	3 <sup>rd</sup> person	INDIR.EVD	indirect evidential
ABES	abessive	INS	instrumental
ACC	accusative	INTF	intensifier
AG.NMLZ	agent nominalizer	ITER	iterative
APPL	applicative	LOC	locative
APPL	applicative	MOD	modality
BEN	beneficiary	MOM	momentaneous
CAUS	causative	NEG	negation
COM	comitative	NMLZ	nominalizer
DEP	dependent verb form	NOM	nominative
DIR.EVD	direct evidential	PL	plural
DIST.PST	distant past	POSS	(external) possession
DUB	dubitative	POT	potential
DUR	durative	REAS	reason
EXCL	exclusive	REC	recent past
FUT	future	SG	singular
GEN	genitive	SOC	sociative causative
HAB	habitual	VPL	verbal plural
IMP	imperative		

---

My sincere thanks go to the Arakbut people, who welcomed me in their communities, kindly hosted me, and patiently taught me their beautiful language.

Dakichi!

IND	1SG.O	1PL.O	2SG.O	2PL.O	3SG/PL.O or Intransitive V
1SG.A	—	—	o'-/o-...-ne 1↔2SG-...-IND	on-...-ne 1↔2PL-...-IND	i'/ih-...-i/-y 1SG(→3)-...-1.IND
1PL.A	—	o'-/o-...-ne 1↔2SG-...-IND			on-...-ne 1↔2PL-...-IND
2SG.A	o'-/o-...-ne 1↔2SG-...-IND		—	—	i'-...-ne 2SG(→3)-...-IND
2PL.A	on-...-ne 1↔2PL-...-IND		—	—	mbo(')/mo(')...-ne 2PL(→3)-...-IND
3SG.A	mbe(')/me(')-...-ne 3SG→1/2SG-...-IND	mbo(')/mo(')...-ne 3→1/2PL-...-IND	mbe(')/me(')-...-ne 3SG→1/2SG-...-IND	mbo(')/mo(')...-ne 3→1/2PL-...-IND	o'-... 3SG(→3).IND-
3PL.A	men-...-ne 3PL→1SG-...-IND		mbo(')/mo(')-...-ne 3PL→2SG-...-IND		on-/ond-... 3PL(→3).IND-

Table 2: Transitive and intransitive cross-reference markers in the indicative mood (Tripp 1995: 209; own fieldnotes)

DUB	1SG.O	1PL.O	2SG.O	2PL.O	3SG/PL.O or Intransitive V
1SG.A	—	—	o-...-∅ 1↔2SG-...-DUB	on-...-∅ (Tripp) 1↔2PL-...-DUB	i'/ih-...-∅ 1SG(→3)-...-DUB
1PL.A	—	—			o-...-∅ 1↔2SG-...-DUB
2SG.A	o-...-∅ 1↔2SG-...-DUB		—	—	i'-...-∅ 2SG(→3)-...-DUB
2PL.A	on-...-∅ 1↔2PL-...-DUB		—	—	mbo(')/mo(')-...-∅ 2PL(→3)-...-DUB
3SG.A	mbe(')/me(')-...-∅ 3SG→1/2SG-...-DUB	mbo(')/mo(')-...-∅ 3→1/2PL-...-DUB	mbe(')/me(')-...-∅ 3SG→1/2SG-...-DUB	mbo(')/mo(')-...-∅ 3→1/2PL-...-DUB	a'/ya'-... 3SG(→3).DUB-...
3PL.A	men-...-∅ 3PL→1SG-...-DUB		mbo(')/mo(')-...-∅ 3PL→2SG-...-DUB		an/and/yan/yand-... 3PL(→3).DUB-...

Table 3: Transitive and intransitive cross-reference markers in the dubitative mood (Tripp 1995: 212; own fieldnotes)

IMP	1SG.O	1PL.O	2SG.O	2PL.O	3SG/PL.O or Intransitive V
1SG.A	—	—	o-...-y/i 1→2SG-...-1.IMP	on-...-y/i 1→2PL-...-1.IMP	a'/a-...-i/-y 1SG(→3).IMP-...-1.IMP
1PL.A	—	—			o-...-y/i 1→2SG-...-1.IMP
2SG.A	mbe(')/me(')-...-∅ 2/3SG→1SG-...-2.IMP	men-/mbo(')/mo(')-...-∅ 2/3→1.IMP-...-2.IMP	—	—	a-/ya-...-∅ 2SG(→3).IMP-
2PL.A	men-/mbo(')/mo(')-...-∅ 2/3→1.IMP-...-2.IMP		—	—	an-/yan-...-∅ 2PL(→3).IMP-
3SG.A	mbe(')/me(')-...-e 2/3SG→1/2SG-...-3.IMP	men-/mbo(')/mo(')-...-e 2/3→1.IMP-...-3.IMP	mbe(')/me(')-...-e 2/3SG→1/2SG-...-3.IMP	mbo(')/mo(')-...-e 3→2.IMP-...-3.IMP	ka'/ka-...-e 3SG(→3).IMP-...-3.IMP
3PL.A	men-/mbo(')/mo(')-...-e 2/3→1.IMP-...-3.IMP		mbo(')/mo(')-...-e 3→2.IMP-...-3.IMP		kan-/kan'-...-e 3PL(→3).IMP-...-3.IMP

Table 4: Transitive and intransitive cross-reference markers in the imperative mood (Tripp 1995: 215; own fieldnotes)

## References

- Adelaar, W. 2000. Propuesta de un nuevo vínculo genético entre dos grupos lingüísticos indígenas de la Amazonía occidental: Harakmbut y Katukina. In *Actas del I Congreso de Lenguas Indígenas de Sudamérica*, L. Miranda Esquerre (ed.), vol. 2, 219-236. Lima: U. Ricardo Palma. — 2007. Ensayo de clasificación del katawixí dentro del conjunto harakmbut-katukina. In A. Romero-Figueroa, A. Fernández Garay, A. Corbera Mori (eds.), *Lenguas indígenas de América del Sur: Estudios descriptivo-tipológicos y sus contribuciones para la lingüística teórica*, 159-169. Caracas: Universidad Católica Andrés Bello. — Crevels, M. & H. van der Voort. 2008. The Guaporé-Mamoré region as a linguistic area. In *From linguistic areas to areal linguistics*, P. Muysken (ed.), 151-79. Amsterdam: Benjamins. — Fonseca Solís, Gustavo. 2002. Lenguas en la Amazonía peruana. Lima: Programa FORTE-PE Ministerio de Educación. — Hart, R. 1963. Semantic components of shape in Amarakaeri Grammar. *Anthropological Linguistics* 5 (9): 1-7. — Heath, Jeffrey. 1991. Pragmatic disguise in pronominal-affix paradigms. In Frans Plank (ed.), *Paradigms: The Economy of Inflection*, 75-89. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. — 1998. Pragmatic Skewing in 1 ↔ 2 Pronominal Combinations in Native American Languages. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 64 (2): 83-104. — Helberg, H. 1984. *Skizze einer Grammatik des Amarakaeri*. PhD dissertation, Tübingen. — Matteson, E. 1972. Proto Arawakan. In E. Matteson et al. (eds.), *Comparative studies in Amerindian languages*, 160-242. The Hague: Mouton. — Pozzi-Escot, Inés (ed.) (1998). *El Multilingüismo en el Perú*. Cuzco: CBC-SID. — Tripp, Robert. 1976. *Los verbos Amarakaeri*. Datos Etno-Lingüísticos: Colección de los archivos del ILV 33. Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. — 1995. *Diccionario amarakaeri-castellano*. Yarinacocha: Min. de Educación & SIL. — Vergara Romani, Liv Kony. 2007. Las lenguas indígenas peruanas. Una panorámica histórica, estructural y sociolingüística. México: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia. — Vogt, Hans. 1940. *The Kalispel Language*. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Academi. — Wise, M. 1999. Small language families and isolates in Peru. In Dixon & Aikhenvald (eds.), *The Amazonian languages*, 307-340. Cambridge: CUP.