Discourse and epistemic modality in Mekens: the frustrative or counter-expectation construction

Abstract

This paper describes the frustrative construction in the Mekens language, focusing on the interplay between epistemic modality and discourse. Mekens is a Tupian language, spoken in the state of Rondonia, Northwest Brazil. The frustrative or adversative construction is a subtype of declarative sentences, signaled by the particle *etaop*. This particle adds a counter-expectation or antithetic meaning to the statement indicating that the expected result of a given event does not obtain. The morphosyntactic and discourse properties of this frustrative construction are discussed, looking especially into its interaction with epistemic and discourse modality in the language.

Key words: frustrative construction; epistemic modality; Tupian langauges

Resumo

Este artigo descreve a construção frustrativa na língua Mekens, com foco na sua interrelação com modalidade epistêmica e unidades de discurso. Mekens é uma língua da família Tupi, falada no estado de Rondônia, noroeste brasileiro. A construção frustativa ou adversativa é uma subcategoria de sentenças declarativas, marcada pela partícula *etaop*. Essa partícula acrescenta à proposição um significado de contra-expectativa ou antitético, indicando que o resultado esperado de um dado evento não se realiza. Descreveremos as propriedades morfossintáticas e pragmáticas dessa construção frustrativa, dando especial atenção à sua interação com modalidade epistêmica e unidades de discurso na língua.

Palavras-chave: construção frustrativa; modalidade epistêmica; línguas Tupi

1. Introduction

Several Amazonian and other South American languages belonging to distinct genetic groups (Arawakan, Cariban, Makuan, Panoan, Tucanoan, Tupian, and some isolate or unclassified languages) are known for having a special grammatical category of 'frustrative', which expresses the notion that the action or event described by the proposition is unsuccessful or 'in vain' (Rodrigues 1953, Ramirez 1997, Aikhenvald 2003, Sparing-Chávez 2003, van der Voort 2004, Epps 2008, Carlin 2009). Even though this feature is not unique to South America, its widespread occurrence in the region prompted it to figure as one of the typologically relevant traits of South American languages (Campbell 2012: 291). For Tupian languages, this feature has long been recognized. One of the first analyses of the frustrative feature in Old Tupi or Tupinambá (Rodrigues 1953) describes it as part of the verbal aspect system. The so-called frustrative aspect in Old Tupi, marked by the suffixe *-biã*, is added to the indicative aspect, and apports the meaning that the goal of the process described by the verb is not attained (Rodrigues 1953: 139). Some of the examples illustrating the frustative in Old Tupi are given in (1) below, extracted from Rodrigues (1953:139)[1].

(1) a.   *a-só-biã*   'I went, but got nothing'

     b.   *a-ra-só-biã*   'I took it in vain'

     c.   *a-îuká-biã*   'I killed him but to no avail'

In this paper I will present the frustrative construction in Mekens, a language also known as Sakurabiat, and spoken by the Sakurabiat People, in the Brazilian Amazonia. There are only about 22 speakers of Mekens, and they are all located in the same área, the *Terra Indígena Rio Mekens*, in the state of Rondonia, near the Brazilian-Bolivian border. Mekens is one of the five members of the Tupari branch of the Tupi linguistic family. The other

members of this branch are Akuntsu, Makurap, Tupari, and Wayoro, all of which are spoken in the same region, in the state of Rondônia.

The frustrative construction in Mekens can be characterized as a subtype of declarative sentences, the declarative adversative (Galucio 2001), but also as a part of the language's modality system. Declarative adversative (frustrative) sentences differ from thegeneral unmarked declarative sentences by having a specific function combined with a formal marker. The Mekens frustrative is signaled by the particle *etaop*, which can modify a verbal or nominal phrase, in afirmative or negative clauses. The use of this frustative particle adds the specific semantics of frustration or of not obtaining the expected result of a proposition. The morphosyntactic and discourse properties of this frustrative construction will be described, with special focus to its interaction with epistemic and discourse modality in the language.

All the linguistic data used in this paper come from the author´s own field notes, collected between 1994–2013, and recorded, transcribed and translated with the help of Mekens native speakers. The examples used here come from formal elicitation sessions, as well as from natural speech. They are presented in a phonemic representation, following the Leipzig glossing rules and conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses (Comrie et Al. 2008).The complete set of Mekens data is deposited at the Museu Goeldi Language Archive and is currently being catalogued and annotated.

The remainder of the paper is structured in the following way. Section 2 gives a quick summary of Mekens epistemic modality system. In section 3, the frustrative or counter-assertive modality is introduced as a subtype of declarative sentence, and its semantics and structural properties are discussed, including its interaction with negation and adverbial modification. Section 4 discusses the interplay of the frustrative construction with modality and discourse, and its cooccurrence with other modality markers. The paper concludes in section 5 with a summary of the topics covered in the previous sections.

2. Frustrative as part of Mekens epistemic modality system

Modality is defined here as a semantic domain that "covers a broad range of semantic nuances (jussive, desiderative, intentive, hypothetical, potential, obligative, dubitative, hortative, exclamative, etc) whose common denominator is the addition of a supplement or overlay of meaning to the most neutral semantic value of the proposition of an utterance, namely factual and declarative." (Bybee and Fleischman 1995: 2). I add to the list of semantic nuances given by Bybee and Fleischman (*ibid.*) the frustrative, which is the topic of this paper.

Palmer (2001) provides a general classification of modality in terms of event modality and propositional or epistemic modality, and further subdivides epistemic modality into the categories of judgments, evidentials and discourse[2]. According to him, epistemic modality can consist of belief and knowledge about the truth or factual status of the proposition and also the evidence the speaker has for it. Following this classification, the Mekens frustrative particle can be analyzed as part of the epistemic modality system of the language, relating to the subsystems of judgment and discourse. It informs about the status of the speaker knowledge (understanding) of the propositon, but it also supplies real world or discourse information.

Mekens modality system includes several semantic distinctions that are expressed by means of postverbal particles[3]. In general, these particles come immediately after the verb stem, and form a complex phrase with it. A list of the main semantic distinctions included in Mekens epistemic modality system is presented in Table 1. Illustrative examples are given in (2a-d).

kẽra	Speculative; non-assertive
toẽt	Presumptive; inferential
eteet	Hypothetical

nẽŋat	Similative
ebõ, eba, te	Assertive, emphatic markers
kot=ke, kot=kaat	Desiderative[4]
pegat	Conditional; irrealis[5]
(e)taop	Frustrative

Table 1. Mekens grammaticalized modality distinctions

(2)   a.   *ɨkɨ=bõ*   *ka*   *pɨbot*   *te=bõ*   *ɨkɨ*   *se-aso-a*

                water=DAT   move arrive 3S=DAT   water 3C-bathe-TV

                se-ko-a   **kẽrã**

                3C-AUX.MOV.IPFV-PST   SPEC

                'He went to the small river, got there, at the river, and apparently stayed there bathing'

    b.   *oẽp*   *ekagɨka*   **tõẽt**   *te*   *ek*   *poot*

                already   fall   PRESPT   FOC   house old

                'I think it has fallen down by now, that old house'/'It has probably fallen down by now, that old house'

    c.   *aose* *nã*   **eteet** *eke-e*

                person COP   HYP   DEM-FIN

                'Ah, if only that one were a man'

    d.   *se-aso*   **pegat** **eteet** *ikão* *se-aso-a*

                3C-bathe   COND HYP   DEM 3C-bathe-TV

                kot kaat-*aab=ese*

                FUT-QUOT.3-NMZ=LOC

                'He could have bathed at that time, if he had wanted to bathe'

    e.   *o-po-ãkã*   *kora*   **etaop**

1S-hand-bone search FRUST

'He/she looked for my bracelet in vain'/ 'He/she looked for my
bracelet, but didn't find it'

Mekens epistemic modal markers (table 1) can be compared to the so-called 'truth and
knowledge markers' found in some Cariban and Arawakan languages, in which a set of
grammatical morphemes are used to express epistemological ideas of reality and truth (Carlin
2009: 135). In the Cariban language Wayana, the 'truth and knowledge markers' include the
facsimile or similative, several assertive or emphatic markers, nominal tense markers,
evidential markers, and a frustrative marker (Carlin 2009: 135; 140). The indication of these
caterories are thus grammaticalized in the language and the markers are obligatorily employed
when pragmatically required by context.

Mekens epistemic modality markers are similar in that respect. Note that sentence
(2e), with the frustrative marker, expresses knowledge of the speaker about the truth and
reality of the world where the proposition is uttered. I turn now to the discussion of the major
semantic and morphosyntactic properties of the frustrative particle, as part of the modality
system found in Mekens. The other modality markers of Mekens will not be further discussed
here, except in relation to the frustrative marker.

3.   Frustrative or counter-assertive modality

There are three sentence types in Mekens: declarative, interrogative and imperative.
From a structural point of view, sentences with the frustrative modality particle are a subtype
of declarative sentences, termed adversative or frustrative sentences (Galucio 2001).

From a semantic point of view, frustrative sentences, like the unmarked declarative
sentences, express a statement, although one with adversative or frustrative results. There are
no attested examples of the frustrative particle in interrogative and imperative sentences. The

frustrative particle *etaop* adds a counter-expectation nuance to the statement, indicating that the expected result of a given event was not attained, as in (3a-b). Note that even though, sentences like (3b) can translate as complex coordinate clauses, they are single declarative frustrative clauses in Mekens.

(3)   a.   *ɨsɨ*   *o-so-a*   *kwat* *õt*   *i-taka*   *etaop*

            deer   1S-see-TV   leave I   3S-follow   FRUST

            'The deer saw me and ran away, I ran after it, but couldn't get it'/ 'The deer saw me and ran away, I followed it, in vain'

     b.   *pedro* *makɨyã*   *mĩ-a-t*   *etaop*

            pedro agouti   kill;shoot-TV-PST   FRUST

            'Pedro shot but didn't kill the agouti'/ 'Pedro shot the agouti, in vain'

When added to a nominal predicate, the frustrative indicates that the set of properties associated with the noun does not apply to its referent or that the noun referent lacks some or all of its intrinsic properties. Example (4a) is a nominal clause, in which the use of the frustrative implies that the set of properties expressed by the predicate no longer applies to the nominal subject. Whithout the frustrative morpheme, the clause would simply means 'your father is the/a shaman', as in the similar clause in (4a'), the change of word order is irrelevant. Example (4b) is extracted from the mythological narrative about the origin of the moon which recounts how a brother deceives her sister and tricks her into having sex with him by pretending to be her husband (Parobaro). The narrator is telling how the sister after getting suspicious decided to mark him with *genipap* fruit dye. The frustrative marker after the noun makes it clear that it was not Parobaro.

(4)   a.   *kwamõã*   *etaop* *e-top*

            shaman   FRUST 2S–father

            'Your father was a/the shaman, but he no longer is'

a'. *o-top*   *kwamõã*

1S–father   shaman

'My father is a/the shaman

b. *s-i-so-ab*   *nã*   *s-ebapi*   *s-õ-taa*   *te=bõ*   *toẽt*

3S-?-see-NMZ COP   3S-forehead   3S-CAUS-spread   3S=DAT   PRESPT

te   *parobaro*   *etaop*

FOC   parobaro   FRUST

'(she) passed it in his forehead to mark it, to the one's (she) believed to be Parobaro'

As for its distribution in the clause, the frustrative marker generally follows the constituent (verb phrase, noun phrase or clause) it modifies, and has local scope over the modified constituent, as in (3) and (4) above. The following sentence (5) also illustrates that distribution. The frustrative marker follows the whole clause, and adds the interpretation that the situation described in the clause preceding the frustrative marker no longer applies, that is, something that used to take place in the remote past does not occur in the present.

(5)   *i-mõt-ka*   *kwariat*   *õt*   *etaop*

3S-make-VBZ   long.ago   I   FRUST

'I used to make it, but do not do it any more'

However, there are a few examples in our corpus where the frustrative particle is more freely distributed in the clause. One such example is given in (6), in which the frustrative particle occurs inside a conjoined relative clause. In that particular example, the frustrative particle occurs twice, once before the relativized verb in the first relative clause, and again after the relativized verb in the second relative clause. The frustrative adds a counter-expectation meaning to the proposition, indicating that the expected result of the interaction

between the jaguar and the other (smaller) animal did not attain, that is, even after being

beaten and bitten by the jaguar the animal did not die.

(6) *kwe   amẽko etaop s-õpot   i-sogop   etaop*

     animal jaguar FRUST NMZ-kill.by.beating NMZ-bite   FRUST

     'the injured animal' (Lit.: 'the animal that the jaguar had beaten and bitten, but not

     killed')

3.1 Frustrative modality and negation

     The frustrative in Mekens falls only partially under the modal scope of negation. The

truth value of an assertion like the one in (3a), repeated here as (7), for instance, is not that the

subject did not follow the deer, but rather that they followed it in vain, that is, that their

following the deer did not produce the expected result of catching the animal.

(7) *isɨ̵   o-so-a   kwat õt   i-taka   etaop*

     deer   1S-see-TV   leave I   3s-follow   FRUST

     'The deer saw me and ran away, I ran after it, but couldn't get it'/ 'The deer saw me

     and ran away, I followed it, in vain'

     When the frustrative is employed in negative declarative clauses, as in (8), it has scope

over the negated proposition, cancelling it. In (8) the proposition asserted by the negated verb

almost happen, but in the end it did not. This state of affairs is expressed by the use of the

frustrative marker. In such cases the frustrative can be translated as 'almost'. A similar

property is found in Tariana, an Arawakan language from Northern Brazil which also has

frustrative modality. In Tariana when the frustrative clitic is used in combination with non-

visual evidentials and other specific adverbs, it is described as reversing its functional

meaning from indicating that an action failed or is bound to fail to indicate that an action was

on the verge of happening but did not happen (Aikhenvald 2003: 381-82).

(8)   *e-teg=õ*   *ka*   *õt*   *e-so-a-r-apo=õt*   *etaop*

         2S-house=DAT   move   I   2S-see-TV-PST=NEG=I   FRUST

         'I went to your house, and almost missed you' /'I went to your house (and) it was

         nearly the case that I didn't see you'

         A distinct reading results in sentences where an afirmative clause, and not a negated one is under the scope of the frustrative modality marker. Compare sentence (8) above with sentences (9a-b) below. In (9a) the frustrative particle occurs between two declarative sentences, an affirmative followed by a negative clause. Since the frustrative particle has scope over the preceding unit, it, thus, cancels the first clause's expectation. Example (9a) is said in a context where the speaker went to the addressee's house, and the neutral expectation is that they would see the addresse, but that expectation was not fullfilled, as they didn't meet. In this case, the negated clause is not under the scope of the frustrative particle, the afirmative first clause is. Note also the second translation provided for (9a) below. Given the distribution of the frustrative particle *etaop* between the two clauses, it functions as an adversative operator. Comparing examples (8) and (9a), we realize that their meanings are quite the opposite of each other. In (8) the frustrative has scope over the negated clause, cancelling the negative proposition, and the result is that speaker and addresse do meet, while in (9a) they do not meet. On the other hand, sentence (9b), without the frustrative particle, has a translation similar to (9a), but it has a more neutral meaning, since there is no implication that some previous expectation was not met.

(9)   a.   *e-teg=õ*   *ka*   *õt*   *etaop*   *e-so-a-r-apo=õt*

             2S-house=DAT   move   I   FRUST   2S-see-TV-PST-NEG=I

             'I went to your house, in vain, I didn't see you'/ 'I went to your house, but

             didn't see you'

     b.   *e-teg=õ*   *ka*   *õt*   *e-so-a-r-apo=õt*

2S-house=DAT   move   I   2S-see-TV-PST=NEG=I

'I went to your house, but didn't see you'/ 'I went to your house and didn't see

you'

A similar interaction between the scope of the frustrative particle and negation can be observed in examples (10). In (10a), the frustrative particle follows a negated verb phrase, cancelling the negation. The use of the frustrative marker adds the information that the result of the event described by the negated verb does not attain, thus reverting the meaning of the proposition. Example (10b), on the other hand, which is similar to (10a), but without the frustrative particle, means that the result of the event described by the negated verb is realized. Thus, in (10a) the final meaning of the sentence is that the wounded animal died, whereas in (10b) the wounded animal did not die.

(10)   a.   *pooriat*   *mĩ-a*   *õt*   *se-pakwa-r-ap*   *etaop*

tapir   kill;shoot-TV   I   3C-die-PST-NEG   FRUST

'I shot the tapir, and it almost survived, but ended up dying'/ I shot the

tapir, and it almost did not die'

b.   *pooriat*   *mĩ-a*   *õt*   *se-pakwa-r-ap*

tapir   kill;shoot-TV   I   3C-die-PST-NEG

'I shot the tapir, but it didn't die'

4.   The interplay between modality and discourse

In the previous section, I have described the frustrative particle *etaop* as part of the epistemic modality system in Mekens. I have shown that frustrative modality indicates that the expected result of a given event is not attained or that the properties or a set of the properties associated with a given noun are not satisfied. In this section, I would like to argue that in Mekens the frustrative particle lies on the frontier between epistemic modality and

discourse. As might be clear from the examples in the previous sections, the frustrative relates

not only to the assertion given in the statement, but also to the expectation of the proposition,

which may be based in the real world knowledge about a situation and not just on purely

linguistic context. For instance, in (11a) which was uttered in a conversational situation, the

proposition tells not only about the desire of drinking coffee, but also about the knowledge

that there is not any coffee to be drunk, and, thus, the impossibility of fulfilling that desire.

The full package of information is entailed by the use of the frustrative particle. In (11b),

extracted from a mythological tale in which the owl carries a young boy and leaves him in the

middle of a river, the frustrative particle helps convey all the information given in parenthesis

in the translation provided below, which is not lexically verbalized.

(11) a.   *põĩ-pɨik*   *sobekar-a*   *sete*   *etaop*

           guts-black   desire-TV   she;he   FRUST

           '(S)he wants (to drink) coffee, but can't (there isn't any)'

     b.   *etaop per-a*   *kẽrã*   *etaop soboj soboj*

           FRUST wake.up-TV   SPEC   FRUST splash splash

           'Then he woke up, apparently (he wanted to get up), but (it was all water

           around him, so when he put his feet outside the hammock) it just made 'splash,

           splash''.

It is important to note the distribution of the frustrative particle vis-à-vis the other

modality particles in Mekens. An indication that the frustrative relates modality and discourse

is the possibility of its cooccurrence with the other epistemic modality particles, affecting the

semantic scope of the whole proposition. There are plenty of examples in our corpus of

cooccurrence between frustrative and dubitatibe/speculative, inferential (presumptive),

desiderative modal markers, and so on. Sentences (12a-b) illustrate the cooccurrence of the

frustrative with the inferential or presumptive particle *tõẽt*, which indicates that the speaker

presumes or believes something to be true. Note that the frustrative has scope over the whole sentence, adding a counter-assertion meaning that undermines the judgment information given by the presumptive particle.

(12) a.

Parobaro	*tõẽt*	*ki-mẽt*		*tõẽt*	*etaop*
Parobaro	PRESPT	1PL.INCL-husband		PRESPT	FRUST

'(I) assumed it to be Parobaro, (I) thought it was our husband, but it is not'

b.

s-jarap		*tõẽt*	*taop*	*te*	*Roque ẽr~ ẽt*
3S-happy;smart		PRESPT	FRUST	FOC	Roque you~EMPH

'Roque thought that you were smart, but you are not' (Lit. "he could be smart, but he isn't, Roque (said) of you')

The same interaction is seen with the speculative particle *kẽra* (13a-b). The particle *kẽra* is a marker of general inferential modality. A sentence with *kẽra* asserts that something seems to be the case, but it might or might not be true. When combined with the frustrative marker, the truth value of the proposition with *kẽra* is that the seemingly result is not achieved.

(13)

pɨɨt	*kẽra*	*õt*	*pe=kwe*		*etaop*
shoot	SPEC	I	OBL=animal		FRUST

kaga	*kaat*	*nẽŋãt*		*sete*
fall	DEM	similative		(s)he

'It appears that I shot the animal, but I missed it. It only seemed like it had fallen down'

When the frustrative particle occurs in combination with the desiderative particles, it adds to the proposition the general meaning that the objet of the desiderative verb phrase will not be realized (14a-b). In the case of (14b) the second clause states the reason why the

desired event will not occur. Desiderative mode in Mekens is obtained by a combination of the immediate future particle *'kot'* and the quotative morphemes *'kaat'* or *'ke'*.

(14) a. *o-ser-a*   *kot*   *ke*   *õt*   *etaop*

          1S-go-TV   FUT   QUOT.12   I   FRUST

          'I want to go, but I won't'/ 'I would like to go, but I can't'

    b. *o-erek-kwa*   *kot*   *ke*   *o-sesoe-r=õt*   *etaop*

          1S-speech-TR.PL.EV   FUT   QUOT.12   1S-AUX.MOV.NPST-link=I   FRUST

          i-ot   *sese*

          3s-full   many

          'I want to go talk there, but I won´t, it is very crowded'

Another example illustrating the distribution of the frustrative as a discourse particle is given in (15), which shows the cooccurrence of the frustrative with the assertive or emphatic particles. The excerpt in (15), extracted from a hunting story, shows that the frustrative particle occurs across the board, and can be used reiteratively (15d) to emphasize the fact that the action fail to give the expected result

(15) a. *poret* *taop* *kwak* *pia* *o-ta-a*   *te=pe*   *i-pi-kwak*

          then   FRUST noise wait 1S-AUX.stand-IPFV   3S=OBL   3s-inside-noise

          'Then I stayed there waiting for the noise, for its roar'

    b. *nõp*   *emõ.*

          NEG   really

          'but there was nothing'

    c. *sete*   *se-pi-kwak*   *aor-a-ra*   *se-pi-kwak*

          (s)he   3C-inside-noise   leave-TV-REP 3C-inside-noise

          aor-a-ra   *paat*   *te*

          leave-TV-REP FUT   truly

'It (out there) will roar pretty soon'

d.   *ke*   *o-ta-a*   *etaop nõp emõ taop te.*

       DEM   1S- AUX.stand-IPFV.PST   FRUST NEG   really   FRUST truly

       'I said this, but nothing, really nothing, nothing happened'

As a final example consider sentences (16a-b). These sentences are extracted from a mythological tale where a boy is forced to do something against the will of his father, ends up being killed in the process, and is, thus, replaced by another entity that pretends to be him. In the case of (16a), the sentence expresses the unfufilled request of the boy to stop what was being done without authorization. The only grammatical information that the boy´s orders are not obeyed comes from the frustrative marker *etaop*. Similarly in (16b), after the boy is replaced by something else, his mother calls for him but is also not answered, since the entity that has taken the place of her son is not human and as such does not understand her call.

(16)   a.   *arẽp sete poret poret oẽp oẽp oẽp etaop te kɨrɨt sara*

          then   he;she now   now   alreadyalreadyalreadyFRUST FOC   child   bad

          se-ajaj-kʷa

          3C-cry-VBZ

          'Then he (said) "now now enough enough enough" in vain, the poor guy was crying'

    b.   *arẽp etaop pega te i-si kɨrɨr-ãp etaop pega*

          then   FRUST call   FOC   3S-mother   child-NEG   FRUST call

          etaop pega

          FRUST call

          'Then his mother called, in vain, it is not a boy, (she) called, and called, in vain (he didn´t come)'

Sentences such as (15) and (16) make it clear that the frustrative marker lies between a grammatical marker of adversative or counter-expectation meaning and the realm of pragmatics and epistemiological modality. Its iterative use in the discourse has also an emphatic function, reafirming the unfufillment of the expectation present in the uttered proposition, which is given not as much by what is uttered but by the knowledge of truths and realities in the world where the proposition is uttered.

5. Final remarks

The present discussion of frustrative modality in Mekens has highlithed the main properties of the frustrative morpheme and how it combines with other modality particles in the language. I have shown that the frustrative particle *etaop* adds to the proposition the specific meaning that the expected result of a given event is not achieved or that an action or event was done in vain, that is, it failed to reach the expected result. In the case of nominal phrases, the use of the frustrative entails that the properties associated with the noun are not satisfied. The frustrative is characterized in Mekens as part of the epistemic modality system, together with the speculative, presumptive, hypothetical, affirmative, and similative markers. In the case of the frustrative, it is used to express knowledge of the speaker about the truth and reality of the world where the proposition is uttered. The combination of frustrative modality with negation reveals an interesting case of double negatives that results in a positive assertion. When applied to a negative phrase, the frustrative has scope over the negated phrase, cancelling the negation. The interaction of frustrative with other epistemic modality markers shows an interesting convergence that brings together epistemic and discourse modality in the language.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra (Ed.). (2004). *Evidentiality*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. (2003). *A grammar of Tariana, from Northwest Amazonia*. Cambridge Grammatical descriptions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bybee, Joan and Suzanne Fleischman (Eds.). (1995). *Modality in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Campbell, Lyle. (2012). Typological characteristics of South American indigenous languages. In L. Campbell and V. Grondona (Eds.), *The Indigenous Languages of South America: A comprehensive guide*, pp. 259-330. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Carlin, Eithne. (2009). Truth and knowledge markers in Wayana (Cariban), Suriname. In Leo Wetzels (ed.) *The Linguistics of Endangered Languages: Contributions to morphology and morphosyntax.* Utrecht: LOT Occasional Series.

Comrie, Bernard, Martin Haspelmath and Balthasar Bickel (Eds). (2008). *The Leipzig Glossing Rules: Conventions for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses.* Leipzig: Department of Linguistics of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology and of the University of Leipzig. ⟨http://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php⟩ (accessed July 2014).

De Haan, F. (1999). Evidentiality and epistemic modality: setting boundaries. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics*, 18, 83-101.

Epps, Patience. (2008). *A grammar of Hup.* (Mouton Grammar Library 43.) Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Galucio, Ana Vilacy. (2001).The Morphosyntax of Mekens (Tupi). Ph.D. dissertation, Chicago: University of Chicago.

Palmer, Frank. (2001). *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2nd edition.

Ramirez, Henri. (1997). *A Fala Tukano dos Yepâ-masa*. Tomo I. Gramática. Tomo II. Dicionário. Tomo III. Método de aprendizagem. Manaus: Inspetoria Salesiana.

Rodrigues, Aryon D. (1953). Morfologia do Verbo Tupi. *Letras*, 1, 121-152.

Sparing-Chávez, M. (2003). I want to but I can't: The frustrative in Amahuaca. *Summer Institute of Linguistics Electronic Working Papers,* SILEWP 2003-002, 13 pp.

Voort, Hein van der. (2004). *A grammar of Kwaza.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, v. 29. 1064p.

List of abbreviations

?	unidentified morpheme	FRUST	frustrative
1, 2, 3	first, second, third person	FUT	future
AUX.MOV	auxiliary for motion	HYP	hypothetical
AUX.STAND	auxiliary for standing	INCL	inclusive
C	coreferential	IPFV	imperfective
CAUS	causative	LINK	linking morpheme
COND	conditional	LOC	locative
COP	copula	NEG	negative
DAT	dative	NMZ	nominalizer
DEM	demonstrative	NPST	non-past
EMPH	emphatic	OBL	oblique
EV	event	PL	plural
FIN	final	PRESPT	presumptive
FOC	focus	PST	past

QUOT	quotative	TR	transitiver
REP	repetitive	TV	them vowel
SPEC	speculative; non-assertive	VBZ	verbalizer

---

[1] In the original paper, the examples were glossed in Portugese: a-só-biã 'fui, mas não consegui nada', a-ra-só-biã 'levei-o debalde', a-îuká-biã 'matei-o, mas sem resultado'.

[2] However, evidentiality has been convincingly proposed to be a separated category, indepedent of the epistemic modality system (de Hann 1999, Aikenvald 2004), and as such will not be further discussed here.

[3] Tense, aspect and mood categories are also expressed through postverbal particles, in Mekens.

[4] Desiderative is a complex marker, that combines the imediate future and quotative morphemes.

[5] The conditional is a complex marker formed with the future and past tense markers: pek 'future' + (a)t 'past'. It is also commonly employed together with the hypothetical particle (cf. example (1d) in the text).