Evidentiality and mirativity in Barbacoan languages:
Was there such a thing as grammatical evidentiality in Proto-
Barbacoan?

Martine Bruil
University of Leiden

In the Barbacoan language family, there are two systems
which are often associated with either evidentiality or
mirativity. One system is a set of verbal affixes that
express evidentiality. These types of affixes are found in
Guambiano and Tsafiki. The other system that has also
been associated with evidentiality and mirativity is often
analyzed as a subject agreement system. Similar systems
can be found throughout the whole language family. In
this paper, I will argue that the subject agreement system
is more likely to have expressed either evidentiality or
mirativity in Proto-Barbacoan than the evidential verbal
affixes that are found in Barbacoan languages in the
present day.

1 Introduction

For linguists that study evidentiality South-America is a very
interesting continent. Evidentiality is often defined as the grammatical
marking of the source of information (Aikhenvald 2004, among others).
Many indigenous languages from South-America express at least some type
of evidentiality, such as reportative evidentiality. Some languages such as
the Tucanoan languages are famous for having very complex systems in
which up to five different evidential meanings are expressed (e.g. Malone
1988; Stenzel 2008). In the Tucanoan family all of these evidential
meanings are expressed in one system of verbal portmanteau suffixes. In
many language families, however, these systems are not as neatly organized.
Evidential meanings can be manifested in different ways from one system
to another and they are often combined with other categories such as
mirativity and epistemic modality.

In the Barbacoan family, there are two systems associated with
evidentiality and mirativity. Mirativity is a concept that is often related to
evidentiality. A mirative form indicates that the speaker did not expect an
event to happen, or in other words, it indicates 'the unprepared mind' of the
speaker (DeLancey 1997). The first evidentiality-related system found in
some of the Barbacoan languages consists of a set of evidential verbal
affixes. The second system is often analyzed as a normal 'subject
agreement' system (Lindskoog & Lindskoog 1964; Moore 1966; Vásquez
de Ruíz 2007, among others), but there is evidence from different
Barbacoan languages that it is not exactly that. It seems that this system is
somehow connected to either mirativity, as Dickinson (2000) suggests or
evidentiality as Curnow (1997) suggests.

Since the evidential verbal affixes are not found in every Barbacoan language and the 'subject agreement' system is mostly not described as an evidential system, it seems fair to ask whether there was something like evidentiality in Proto-Barbacoan. This question will be explored in this paper. In order to discuss this question it is useful to have some background information on the family. This will be addressed in section 2. In section 3, I will present the evidential verbal affix systems in the Barbacoan family. In section 4, I will discuss why the so-called 'subject agreement' system is not in fact a subject agreement system. Finally I will give some concluding remarks in section 5.

2   The Barbacoan family

The Barbacoan family is a small language family consisting of five languages that are still spoken today. The languages are spoken in the south of Colombia and in Ecuador. The family consists from north to south of Guambiano, Totoró, Awa Pit, Cha'palaa and Tsafiki. Not all of the Barbacoan languages are very closely related. The differences between the Northern Barbacoan languages (Guambiano, Totoró and Awa Pit) and Southern Barbacoan languages (Cha'palaa and Tsafiki) are substantial. Cha'palaa and Tsafiki, however, are much more closely related and it is much easier to find correspondences between the languages (see Moore 1962). Guambiano and Totoró also appear to be very closely related and they may even be varieties of one another (Curnow & Liddicoat 1998).

Not all of these languages are well described and documented. For instance, there is very little information on Totoró, and since there are only a few speakers left of the language, it is quite probable that this language will never be described (see Curnow & Liddicoat 1998). Therefore, this language will not be taken into account in this paper. Although a lot of documentation work and description on the other languages as well is still needed, in this paper I will present an overview of the systems related to evidentiality that have been described until now and I will present my views on the existence of these systems in Proto-Barbacoan.

3   Evidential verbal affixes

The first system I will discuss is the set of verbal affixes that have been described as evidentials. Such an evidential system has been described for both Guambiano and Tsafiki (Dickinson 2000;2002; Triviño Garzon 1992; Vásquez de Ruíz 2007). The systems of each language, however, differ greatly. First, I will give a short description of the Guambiano system (3.1). Then I will show the evidential system in Tsafiki (3.2) and finally, I will compare the two systems and give a historical perspective of the two (3.3).

3.1   The Guambiano evidential system

In Guambiano different evidential meanings can be expressed with suffixes that are mostly verb-final. The expression of evidentiality is not obligatory in Guambiano. When these verbal suffixes are used, they replace the 'subject agreement' on the verb. The evidential meanings that can be

expressed by the evidential suffixes are in Vásquez de Ruíz' (2007) terminology: a visual, a non-visual, an assumptive and an unconscious evidential[1]. Visual information is expressed by the suffix *-tre*[2] and it is only used when the speaker wants to emphasize that he or she has eye-witnessed the event. An example of this evidential can be found in (1):

(1)   Peru   kuall-tre. (Vásquez de Ruíz 2007:94).[3]
        Pedro   work-VS.
        'Pedro is working.' (I see him).

Example (1) is only used if the speaker sees Pedro work. It also means that the speaker is quite certain about his or her statement. The evidential *–tre* is not always used as a verbal suffix as Vásquez de Ruíz (2007:93) also notes. It can occasionally be used on nouns, as can be seen in example (2):

(2)   na   mər-ən   unə-tre   sruk   kuts-an. (VdR 2007:94)
        1SG   hear-IMPF   child-VS   pebble   throw-CNJ.
        'I heard *the child* throwing the pebble.'

In example (2), the visual evidential *–tre* is used on the noun *unə* 'child'. The speaker expresses his or her certainty about the child throwing the pebble. There also appears to be some emphasis on it being the child who did the throwing. The visual interpretation is apparently lost in this case, since the speaker heard the sound of the child throwing the pebble, he or she does not appear to have seen the action. In this example, therefore, *–tre* marks emphasis and certainty.

The morpheme *-tre* only appears to express certainty when there is no aspect marker, because in combination with the resultative the sentence obtains an assumptive meaning. An example of this is presented below in (3):

(3)   Peru-pe   kua-in-tre. (VdR 2007:95).
        Pedro-TOP   work-RES-VS.
        'Pedro must have worked.'

---

[1] Triviño (1992) analyses the evidentials as direct knowledge, indirect knowledge and putative modality. The unconscious evidential is not present in Triviño's analysis. The indirect knowledge evidential includes auditive information and information from other senses. Therefore, it seems better to use the terms visual and non-visual for these two evidentials in Guambiano.

[2] *-trə* in Triviño's (1992) analysis.

[3] The abbreviations used in this paper are: 1 = 1st person, 2 = 2nd person, 3 = 3rd person, ACC = accusative, ASS = Assumptive, CMP = completive, CNJ = conjunct, DCL = declarative, DSJ = disjunct, DUR = durative, EMP = emphasis, EV = evidential, IMPF = imperfective, IMPF.P = imperfective participle, INSTR = instrumental, INTN = intension, HS = hearsay, MSC = masculine, NG = negation, NOM = nominalizer, N.VS = non-visual, PL = plural, PST = past, RES = resultative, SBJ = subject, SG = singular, SUBORD = subordinate, TOP = topic-marker, UNC = unconscious, UND = undergoer, VdR= Vázquez de Ruíz, VCL = verbal classifier, VS = visual

In example (3), the speaker infers from the situation that Pedro has been working. That is, he or she does not have any direct evidence. This alternation between visual and inferential meaning within one single form is not very common cross-linguistically. There is, however, a relation between a resultative meaning and an inferential meaning. When speakers use a resultative, they may imply that they did not witness the event, but only the results. This implication sometimes generalizes into an inferential meaning. This is what happened historically, for instance, in Persian (Lazard 1985). Still, it is strange that a form which explicitly states visual information in the present tense obtains an inferential interpretation in combination with the resultative. The question arises then as to whether the evidential meaning of –*tre* is truly visual.

Non-visual evidentiality is expressed by the suffix –*shi*. This marker is often used with auditive information as can be seen in example (4), or information that is gained though other senses (5):

(4)   Sre   pu-shi.   (VdR 2007:96)
        rain   arrive-N.VS.
        'It is raining.' (Inside the house you can hear the noise.).

(5)   Na-n-ne   ki   kə-shi. (VdR 2007:95).
        1SG-ACC-EMP   sleepy   be-N.VS
        'I am sleepy.'

These sensations can also be expressed by other constructions and –*shi* does not always express auditive or other sensorial information. In example (6) it is hard to imagine that the person is referring to an event that he or she did not eye-witness:

(6)   Juliu   waara-wan   yan-shi. (Triviño Garzon 1992:223).
        Julio   cow-ACC   sell-N.VS
        'Julio sold me the cow.' (Different people wanted to buy the cow.)

In example (6), it is most likely that the speaker eye-witnessed and was involved in the event of Julio selling him a cow. By using the suffix –*shi* in this case the speaker expresses his or her appreciation about Julio selling him or her the cow, since there were other bidders. In this case, the suffix –*shi* appears to express the subjectivity of the speaker, which could very well be an extension of the information through internal feelings that –*shi* often expresses.

Another evidential meaning that can be found in Guambiano is the assumptive. The assumptive is marked by the suffix –*penti*, as in (7):

(7)   unə   ki-p-penti. (Vásquez de Ruíz 2007:98).
        child   sleep-DUR-ASS.
        'The child is probably sleeping.'

In example (7), the speaker has no evidence for the fact that the child is asleep. He or she only assumes it since the child has been quiet for some time.

The final evidential-like form that Vásquez de Ruíz (2007) presents is the verbal suffix *–ra*. This is a suffix with evidential- or mirative-like meaning that is not in the same paradigm as the other affixes, since it is often followed by the resultative suffix and it is most often followed by an auxiliary verb, as is shown in example (8):

(8)   Na-pe   Jose-wan kutr-əp-ra-in   k-ən. (VdR 2007:99).
        1-TOP   José-ACC hit-DUR-UNC-RES be-DSJ.
        'I must have hit José.' (Without realizing).

The suffix *–ra* is followed by the resultative suffix *–in* and it is not on the finite verb in example (8). Rather, the finite verb is the auxiliary verb *kap* 'be'. The other evidential suffixes are normally not followed by any other suffix and when there is an auxiliary verb in the sentence they would occur on the auxiliary. The meaning of the suffix, however, seems to be evidential. According to Vásquez de Ruíz (2007:98), the speaker infers the event from evidence when he or she uses the suffix *–ra*, which is often referred to as an inferential in evidential terminology. The suffix is also used in the case of later awareness, as can be seen in example (8). This is typically a mirative use of the suffix.

Although evidentiality is not expressed in every sentence and the evidential suffixes are not all part of the same paradigm, Guambiano has developed a system to express evidential meanings. However, the exact functions of the suffixes need to be further investigated; they have either evidential, mirative or modal functions.

3.2   The Tsafiki evidential system

Tsafiki is also described as a language with an evidential system. This system does not express epistemic modality, but it does interrelate with mirativity. The evidential meanings that can be expressed in Tsafiki are direct information, inference, assumption and hearsay[4] (Dickinson 2000;2002). Examples of the Tsafiki evidentials are given below:

(9)   Manuel ano   fi-e. (Dickinson 2000:407)[5].
        Manuel food   eat-DCL.
        'Manuel ate.'

(10)   Manuel ano   fi-nu-e. (Dickinson 2000:408).
        Manuel food   eat-EV-DCL.
        'Manuel has eaten.'

(11)   Manuel ano   fi-n-ki-e. (Dickinson 2000:408).
        Manuel food   eat-NOM-VCL:do-DCL.
        'Manuel must have eaten.'

---

[4] The Tsafiki evidentials can co-occur with the 'subject agreement' morphemes, here forming a contrast with Guambiano.
[5] In these examples, there is no overt subject agreement, since second and third person are unmarked in the declarative.

(12)   Manuel   ano   fi-nu-ti-e. (Dickinson 2000:408).
        Manuel   food   eat-EV-HS-DCL.
        'He said/they say Manuel has eaten.'

The different evidential meanings in Tsafiki are not expressed in a neat paradigm, as can be seen in the examples above. Example (9) is used when the speaker has eye-witnessed Manuel eating. There is no evidential form present; direct information is unmarked in the language. The unmarked form can also be used for general information.

The inferential, as can be seen in example (10), is marked with the suffix *–nu*. In this case the speaker has found, for instance, the empty dishes and therefore has evidence that Manuel has eaten. The assumptive form in example (11) consists of a nominalizer *–n-*[6] and a verb class marker (*ki* 'do' in this example). This construction is used when a speaker has not eye-witnessed an event or any physical evidence that it occurred. In example (11), for instance, the speaker knows that Manuel always eats at 5pm. So at 6pm he or she says that Manuel must have eaten already, because he always eats before that time. The inferential and the assumptive evidentials are mutually exclusive, which could mean that they belong to the same paradigm, but this is not consistent with the fact that they are formally different, since *–nu* is a suffix and the assumptive is formed by a verbal construction.

The hearsay marker *–ti*, which is identical to the verb *ti* 'say', is clearly not in the same paradigm as the other evidentials, because the marker is not mutually exclusive with the other evidentials. As can be seen in example (12), *-ti* can co-occur with other evidential markers such as the inferential *–nu*. This combination means that the event is a report and that the person who told the speaker about the event knows about it through inference.

In summary, Tsafiki speakers do express evidential meanings. Tsafiki does not have one evidential paradigm. Evidential meanings can be expressed with markers which occupy more or less the same position on the verb. Formally, the different evidentials do not form one paradigm.

3.3   A comparison of the Guambiano and Tsafiki evidential systems

The evidential systems in Guambiano and Tsafiki are very different in various ways. First of all, the evidential markers do not occur in the same position on the verb. The evidential suffixes in Guambiano are in the final position of the verb, except for *–ra* and they replace the suffixes that are described as 'subject agreement'. In Tsafiki, the evidential forms can occur together with the 'subject agreement' and they are not found in a final position on the verb. The declarative marker *-e* and the dubitative marker *–ko*[7] often follow the evidential forms.

Also formally the evidentials in Guambiano and Tsafiki are very different. Based on the available data, it is impossible to reconstruct any of

---

[6] The nominalizer *–n-* is pronounced as a nasalization of the final vowel.
[7] The dubitative marker *–ko* is analyzed by Dickinson (2002) as an epistemic modal and not as an evidential.

the evidentials in Guambiano and Tsafiki. The forms –*tre*, -*shi*, -*penti* and –*ra* do not share the same morphological make-up with –*nu*, -*n* + verbal classifier and –*ti*. Semantically, these forms are also very different. Guambiano appears to have a visual / non-visual distinction that can not be found in Tsafiki and the inferential and assumptive do not function the same way. Tsafiki has a hearsay evidential that cannot be found in Guambiano. Therefore, there does not appear to be a common origin for the Guambiano and Tsafiki evidential systems.

There is, however, one similarity between the Guambiano and the Tsafiki evidential systems. They can both be found in the verbal domain. As was argued above, this is probably not due to a common origin of these systems, but it may be due to structural similarities between the languages. Both languages contain auxiliary verb constructions and at least in Tsafiki some of the evidential forms have originated from auxiliary verb constructions.

In Tsafiki, the direct form, which is also used for general information, is unmarked and is therefore the neutral form. The hearsay marker –*ti* is identical to the verb *ti* 'say' and it often still means that someone said something. It appears to be in the early stages of grammaticalization. The suffix –*ti* is also part of the group of verbal classifiers which have developed out of auxiliary verb constructions. The assumptive construction –*n* + a verbal classifier also appears to have that origin; a verb was nominalized and an auxiliary verb was used to construct the predicate. It is likely that this auxiliary verb became suffixed and obtained its function as verbal classifier. It is more difficult to find the origin for the inferential form –*nu*. It is not clear whether this form developed out of an auxiliary verb construction, or whether a grammatical suffix such as an epistemic modal or tense suffix shifted in meaning. It is also possible that this form was present in the proto-language and it was lost in the other Barbacoan languages. These ideas about the origin of –*nu* are mere speculations. Nevertheless, the evidential system in Tsafiki as it is used now is probably a rather recent development in Tsafiki and was not part of Proto-Barbacoan. A better documentation and analysis of Cha'palaa may also yield more insights on this matter.

The Guambiano evidential system is even more opaque with regard to its origin. Nevertheless, some of the evidentials may also have originated from auxiliary verb constructions. For instance, the visual evidential –*tre* may have evolved out of a nominalized verb in combination with an auxiliary. One such candidate is the auxiliary verb *tr-ap*, which consists of the stem *tr*- and the infinitival suffix –*ap*. The suffix –*tre* may originally have been a form of this auxiliary verb.

There are a few problems with this analysis, however. First of all, there is no nominalizing suffix before –*tre* to point out that the origin of this evidential is an auxiliary construction. Guambiano has many different suffixes to nominalize a verb. Luckily for this analysis, a verb can also be nominalized by using only the stem (Vásquez de Ruíz 1988) and in the constructions with *trap* there is no overt nominalization found on the lexical verb.

A second even bigger problem is that the auxiliary *trap* nowadays expresses that an event is potentially true, but there is little certainty about it. According to Vásquez de Ruíz (1992), the speaker cannot have any

visual information when he uses this verb and the statement arises from reasoning alone. This is the opposite of what the suffix –*tre* means, or at least what the suffix means when it does not occur in combination with the resultative –*in* (cf. example(3)). The assumptive reading of the suffix –*tre* in combination with the resultative –*in*, on the other hand, could very well be explained by the suggestion that –*tre* originated from the potential auxiliary *trap*. There is even a possibility that the stronger modal meaning of certainty developed out of the weaker modal meaning of potentiality. This is what happened with the English verb *must*, which used to express possibility and developed to express obligation (Traugott & Dasher 2002:120-137).

Another possible candidate for the origin of the evidential suffix -*tre* the auxiliary verb 'be' that according to Lindskoog & Lindskoog (1964:125) in Cha'palaa is *tsu-nu*, *tsu* being the stem and –*nu* being the infinitival suffix. The development from an auxiliary with a meaning like 'be' into visual or direct evidential is common. In some Panoan (Camargo 1996) and Tucanoan (Malone 1988) languages the auxiliary 'be' has also developed into a visual or a direct evidential. There is a problem, however, with relating –*tre* to *tsunu*, as it does not fit in with the sound correspondences that were found between Cha'palaa and Guambiano. The regular correspondence of a /ts/ in Cha'palaa is also a /ts/ Guambiano and the regular correspondence of /u/ in Cha'palaa is either an /o/ or an /u/ in Guambiano (Curnow & Liddicoat 1998). Nevertheless, these correspondences are not based on a lot of entries, so there is a possibility that the correspondences will be revised in the future when there is more information. Maybe then a relation can be established between *tsunu* and the evidential suffix –*tre*. In sum, it is not sure what the origin of –*tre* is but it may be an auxiliary verb construction.

The unconsciousness marker –*ra* may also find its origin in an auxiliary verb construction. In all the examples in Vásquez de Ruíz's article (2007:98-99) –*ra* is preceded by the suffix –Vp-, which the author glosses as a durative form (cf. example 7). This form, however, is a very common nominalizing suffix (Vásquez de Ruíz 1988). It would also not be inconceivable that –*ra* used to be an auxiliary verb. In Tsafiki, we find this exact verb *ra* 'be in a position' being used as a verbal classifier (Dickinson 2000;2002), which, as we have seen before, developed out of an auxiliary construction. However, the semantic change from 'be in a position' to an unconsciousness marker is quite large. So again, this origin of –*ra* is just a speculation, but it would be interesting to further explore this idea.

As for the other suffixes –*shi* and –*penti* it is even harder to get an idea on their origins. As Vásquez de Ruíz (2007:96) observes the suffix –*shi* is formally identical to the indirect evidential –*shi* in Quechua. Semantically however, the suffixes are not identical, but still Guambiano may have borrowed this form from Quechua and slightly changed its meaning. For the evidential –*penti*, I do not have a clear account.

What remains clear from this is that more research is needed on the exact semantics of the evidential suffixes in Guambiano and in the other Barbacoan languages in order to obtain more than mere speculations on the origin of this evidential system. Nevertheless, there is a possibility that at least some of the evidential markers in Guambiano have developed from auxiliary verb constructions. This is quite similar to what happened in

Tsafiki. This possible similarity is likely due to the fact that the structures of the languages are similar.

4   'Subject agreement'

The other system in Barbacoan languages mentioned with respect to evidentiality is the system that is often analyzed as a subject agreement system. Such 'subject agreement' systems behave in similar ways among all the Barbacoan languages, although formally the markers are rather different. At first hand, this verbal morphology looks a lot like subject agreement. In the declarative, there is an opposition between first person on the one hand and second and third person on the other hand. This is shown in examples (13) and (14) from Cha'palaa:

(13)   Ji-n-tsu-yu. (Lindskoog & Lindskoog 1964:124)
        go-NOM-be-1.
        'I am going.'

(14)   Ji-n-tsu-ve. (Lindskoog & Lindskoog 1964:124).
        go-NOM-be-2/3
        'You/(s)he are/is going.'

The markers *–yu* and *–ve* in examples (13) and (14) could very well be 'subject agreement'; -*yu* appears to mark first person and *–ve* marks either second or third person. This system is not very uncommon. Similar systems are found in other Barbacoan languages as well.

Interestingly, there are some changes in the use of the verbal morphology in the interrogative mood. In the interrogative mood, 'first person subject agreement' is not used for first person anymore, but for second person as can be seen in table 1 with data from Awa Pit:

Table 1: verbal marking in the declarative and the interrogative in the non-past in Awa Pit. (Table adopted from Curnow 1997:191):

Person	Declarative	Interrogative
1st	-s	-y
2nd	-y	-s
3rd	-y	-y

In table 1 it can be seen that in the interrogative the first and third person marking is in opposition to the second person. This difference between the declarative and the interrogative has been reported for Awa Pit, Cha'palaa and Tsafiki (Curnow 1997;2002; Dickinson 200;2002; Lindskoog & Lindskoog 1964). It is not clear whether it also exists in Guambiano.

Since the verbal marking does not fit in a traditional first, second and third person subject agreement system, different terminology was used for these markers. The form for first person declarative and second person interrogative is referred to as congruent (Dickinson 2000;2002) or conjunct (Curnow 2002). These forms are used when the subject of the verb is congruent or conjunct with the epistemic authority. The epistemic authority is the person who has the authority over the knowledge expressed by the

utterance. In the case of statements, the speaker has the authority over the knowledge and in case of a question the speaker attributes that authority to his interlocutor, because the speaker wants knowledge from him (Curnow 1997:209). The other form is referred as non-congruent (Dickinson 2000;2002) and disjunct, since the subject is not congruent or conjunct with the epistemic authority. Henceforth I will use Curnow's (2002) terminology.

The Tsafiki system is not completely the same as the Awa Pit system; it is slightly more complex. In Tsafiki, the first person subject agreement in the declarative mood is the same as the marking for second person in the interrogative mood, as is the case in Awa Pit. The third person marking is also the same in both declarative and interrogative moods. The first person in the interrogative mood, however, obtains a different marker then the other forms. This is shown in table 2:

Table 2: verbal marking in the declarative and the interrogative in Tsafiki. (Data from Dickinson 2000:383-384):

Person	Declarative	Interrogative
1st	-yo	-i
2nd	-Ø	-yo
3rd	-Ø	-Ø

In table 2 it can be observed that the second and third persons in the declarative mood and the third person in the interrogative mood are unmarked. This is the neutral form, that is, it is neither conjunct nor disjunct. First person in the declarative and second person in the interrogative are marked with the conjunct form -*yo* (or congruent in Dickinson's (2000;2002) terminology). First person obtains a disjunct (or non-congruent) marker in the interrogative mood.

It is possible that a verb has different subject agreement markers for declaratives and interrogatives. Therefore this verbal morphology could still be subject agreement. Nevertheless, taking a closer look at the use of these morphemes shows that they do behave differently. Examples of this non-subject agreement-like behavior can be found in different languages. For instance, in Guambiano the conjunct form is not always used in the declarative when there is a first person subject. An example of this is presented in (15):

(15)   An   kətsə-n-ne   srəna-pe
        silver pot-ACC-EMP   tomorrow-TOP

        wetetr-am-ən   tr-un. (VdR 2007:101).
        find-INTN-IMPF   be.potentially-DSJ
        'I will find the treasure tomorrow.'

In example (15), there is a first person subject, but a disjunct form is used. When the suffix –*am*, which expresses the intention of doing something in the future, is used, the verb takes a disjunct form although the subject is first person. Since the speaker is just expressing an intention and not something that happened already, he or she cannot fully vouch for the information and

the speaker does not want to take the authority over the information. Therefore a conjunct form cannot be used.

Similarly in Awa Pit, conjunct and disjunct forms do not always follow a subject agreement pattern either. Awa Pit has a more complex system in the past tense than other Barbacoan languages. Awa Pit has the normal conjunct / disjunct distinction in the past tense, yet there is an extra distinction within the conjunct system. Not only a conjunct subject is expressed, but also a conjunct object or undergoer has its own marker in Awa Pit. This is shown in the following examples from (Curnow 2002:618):

Conjunct subject marker:
(16)   Kın-ka=na,   na=na   Santos=ta   izh-ta-w.
        dawn-when-TP,   1SG=TOP Santos=ACC   see-PST-CNJ.SBJ.
        'At dawn I saw Santos.'

Conjunct undergoer marker:
(17)   Demetrio=na   tıt-ma-tı-s.
        Demetrio-TOP   cut-CMP-PST-CNJ.UND.
        'Demetrio cut me.'

Disjunct subject marker:
(18)   Pına   alu   ki-ma-tı-zi. (Curnow 2002:621).
        very   rain   do-CMP-PST-DSJ.
        'It rained heavily.'

In examples (16) to (18) it can be seen that the Awa Pit past tense verbal morphology functions according to a conjunct / disjunct system. That is, the conjunct is used when there is a first person subject in declaratives (16) and a second person subject in interrogatives. The disjunct is used in the other cases (18). Unless there is a conjunct undergoer, that is, a first person undergoer in declaratives (17) and a second person undergoer in interrogatives, there is an extra specification for these functions. This system is not a subject agreement system, since not only subjects are marked on the verb. Awa Pit seems to have a combination of subject and object marking in the past tense.

Interestingly however, sometimes a subject and sometimes an object is marked and not just randomly. That is, in the declarative mood the speaker also marks his or her involvement in the event: he or she either carried out the action, he or she was involved in the action in some way or he or she had no connection to the action. In the interrogative mood, it is the interlocutor, as the replaced epistemic authority, that has to portray these functions. Curnow (1997:212) links this to a possible evidential origin. His hypothesis is that the original meanings of these markers were: "I know this because I did it", "I know this because I was involved" and "I know this but not because I was involved". According to the hypothesis, these meanings shifted towards a person marking system.

In Tsafiki there are also some strong indications that the verbal morphology is not a subject agreement system. For instance, it is not always the conjunct that is used in combination with a first person subject. This is shown in the examples from Dickinson (2000:387):

(19)   La   ya=ka   machite=chi   pore-yo-e.
        1MSC   3=ACC   machete=INSTR   cut-CNJ-DCL.
        'I cut him/her with a machete (intentionally).'

(20)   La   ya=ka   machite=chi   pore-i-e.
        1MSC   3=ACC   machete=INSTR   cut-DSJ-DCL.
        'I cut him/her with a machete (unintentionally).'

If the speaker uses the conjunct form, as in example (19), he[8] expresses that he carried out an action intentionally. When he did not have the intention of carrying out a certain action, as in example (20), the speaker will use the disjunct form. The disjunct form allows the speaker to distance himself from the event. That is why this form is often also used for unexpectedness and a later awareness. Dickinson (2000;2002), therefore, analyses the system as a mirative system.

Another indication that the conjunct / disjunct system in Tsafiki does not behave as a subject agreement is that a conjunct form can also be used with a third person subject, where normally a neutral form would be expected. This is shown in example (23) from Dickinson (2002:96):

(21)   Amana   tsachi=la   fi-tu-min=la   jo-yo-e.
        Nowadays   person=PL   eat-NG-IMPF.P=PL   be-CNJ-DCL.
        'Nowadays, the Tsachila don't eat (snakes).' (They used to in the past).

In example (21) the subject *tsachila*[9] 'persons' is a third person subject, but we find a conjunct marker on the verb. The speaker uses this form to show that he or she is part of the Tsachila and therefore, he or she is involved in the action of not eating snakes anymore. Dickinson (2000) also analyses this example within the concept of mirativity. Since not eating snakes is part of the speakers mindset, this is an expected action. To me it seems more plausible that the speaker expresses his or her involvement. This involvement analysis would also work for the cases in which the speaker uses a disjunct form with a first person. In those cases the speaker seems to express his or her lack of involvement.

Concluding, the conjunct / disjunct systems in Barbacoan languages have many similarities in their use and therefore it is quite possible that they have a common origin. The systems do not behave as subject agreement systems. Examples from different Barbacoan languages have shown that different concepts such as the epistemic authority, certainty and the involvement of the speaker / epistemic authority play a role in the use of the conjunct and disjunct form. As was mentioned above, these concepts have been related to evidentiality (Curnow 1997) and mirativity (Dickinson 2000;2002). What the analyses of the conjunct / disjunct systems by Curnow (1997) and Dickinson (2000;2002) have in common is that in both analyses the concept of involvement of the speaker/epistemic authority is crucial. The Guambiano example (15) can

[8] In examples (19) and (20), the speaker is masculine as it can be seen from the use of the masculine first person pronoun.
[9] The Tsachila are the speakers of Tsafiki.

probably also be seen in that light. When a speaker talks about an action that is intended in the future, he is not fully involved in it yet.

Since the concept of involvement appears to be important in the conjunct / disjunct systems in the Barbacoan languages as they are spoken today, this verbal morphology quite possibly also expressed the involvement of the epistemic authority in Proto-Barbacoan. It is not the first time that a verbal paradigm is claimed to express involvement. The concept of involvement is also the main focus in Wheeler's (1987) analysis of a paradigm of verbal forms in Siona, a Western Tucanoan language. Interestingly, very similar systems in other Tucanoan languages are analyzed as evidential systems (Malone 1988; Stenzel 2008 among others). This means that there may very well be a relation between involvement and evidentiality. The theoretical question remains how this concept of involvement is related to evidentiality and mirativity.

5   Concluding remarks

As we have seen above, the Barbacoan languages today have evidential and mirative-like features, but whether evidentiality was part of Proto-Barbacoan, is not very certain. The evidential affixes in Guambiano and Tsafiki were probably a more recent innovation. The auxiliary verb constructions could be a good source form for at least some of the evidential forms in Guambiano and Barbacoan, but more research on the Barbacoan languages is needed. An understanding of the exact semantics of these evidential forms is indispensable for the reconstruction of these evidential systems. The semantic description of auxiliary verb constructions in the different Barbacoan languages would also be necessary in order to prove that at least some evidential affixes developed out of those constructions.

As for the conjunct / disjunct system, it is also not clear whether the system used to express evidentiality in Proto-Barbacoan. There seems to be a relation between the involvement of the epistemic authority and the verbal endings in questions in the different Barbacoan languages. Involvement appears to be a related concept to evidentiality in some languages. Nevertheless, whether this was the case in Proto-Barbacoan remains a question for further research. However, since the conjunct / disjunct system may very well have been part of Proto-Barbacoan, it is more likely that if there was such a thing as evidentiality in Proto-Barbacoan that it was expressed by the proto conjunct / disjunct system.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. (2004). *Evidentiality*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Camargo, Eliane (1996). Valeurs médiatives en Caxinauá. In Guentchéva (ed.) *L'énonciation mediatisée*. Bibliothèque de l'information grammaticale. Peeters, Louvain. pp. 271-84.

Curnow, Timothy Jowan (1997). *A grammar of Awa Pit (Cuaiquer): An indigenous language of south-western Colombia*. PhD Dissertation. Australian National University, Camberra.

Curnow, Timothy Jowan (2002). Conjunct/disjunct marking in Awa Pit. *Linguistics* 40/3. pp. 611-627.

Curnow, Timothy Jowan & Anthony J. Liddicoat (1998). The Barbacoan languages of Colombia and Ecuador. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40/3. pp. 384-408.

DeLancey, Scott (1997). Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information. *Linguistic Typology* 1. pp. 33-52.

Dickinson, Connie (2000). Mirativity in Tsafiki. *Studies in Language* 24/2. pp. 379-421.

Dickinson, Connie (2002). *Complex predicates in Tsafiki*. PhD Dissertation. University of Oregon, Eugene.

Lazard, Gilbert (1985). L'inférenciel ou passé distancie en Persan. *Studia Iranica* 14. pp. 27-42.

Lindkoog, John N. & Carrie A. Lindskoog (1964). *Vocabulario cayapa*. Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, Quito.

Malone, Terrell (1988). The Origin and Development of Tuyuca Evidentials. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 54. pp. 119-140.

Moore, Bruce R. (1962). Correspondences in South Barbacoan Chibcha. In Elson (ed.) *Studies in Ecuadorian Indian languages*: I. Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, Mexico DF. pp. 270-289.

Moore, Bruce R. (1966). *Diccionario castellano-colorado colorado-castellano*. Instituto Lingüístico de Verano, Quito.

Stenzel, Kristine (2008). Evidentials and clause modality in Wanano. *Studies in Language* 32/2. pp. 405-445.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs and Richard B. Dasher (2002). *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Triviño Garzon, Lilia (1992). Sobre la modalidad en la lengua guambiana. In Rojas Curieux (ed.) *Lenguas aborigenes de Colombia, Memorias 2*. Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá. pp. 219-227.

Vásquez de Ruíz, Beatriz (1988). La predicación en Guambiano. *Lenguas aborigenes de Colombia*. Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá.

Vásquez de Ruíz, Beatriz (1992). La modalidad epistemica en Guambiano. In Rojas Curieux (ed.) *Lenguas aborigenes de Colombia, Memorias 2*. Universidad de los Andes, Bogotá. pp. 209-218.

Vásquez de Ruíz, Beatriz (2007). Les opérations de modalisation épistémique en Guambiano. In Guentchéva & Landaburu (eds.). *L'énonciation médiatisée II*. Le traitement épistémologique de l'information: illustrations amérindiennes et caucasiennes. Peeters, Leuven. pp. 87-110.

Wheeler, Alvaro (1987). *Gantëya Bain. El pueblo siona de río Putumayo, Tomo I*. Editorial Townsend, Lomalinda.

Martine Bruil
m.bruil@hum.leidenuniv.nl