

University of Groningen

The poetics of recapitulative linkage in Matsigenka and mixed Matsigenka-Spanish myth narrations

Emlen, Nicholas Quinn

Published in:
 Bridging constructions

DOI:
[10.5281/zenodo.2563680](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2563680)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
 Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
 2019

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Emlen, N. Q. (2019). The poetics of recapitulative linkage in Matsigenka and mixed Matsigenka-Spanish myth narrations. In V. Guérin (Ed.), *Bridging constructions* (pp. 45–77). Language Science Press. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2563680>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Chapter 2

The poetics of recapitulative linkage in Matsigenka and mixed Matsigenka-Spanish myth narrations

Nicholas Q. Emlen

John Carter Brown Library, Brown University

In a small community in the Andean-Amazonian transitional zone of Southern Peru, speakers of Matsigenka use recapitulative linkages in myth narrations. These constructions establish a kind of rhythm, distinctive to the myth narration discourse genre, through which the events of the narrative unfold, information is introduced and elaborated, and suspense and surprise are achieved. This chapter describes the structural and discursive properties of these linking devices and their use in myth narrations. Bridging clauses generally recapitulate reference clauses verbatim or with minor modifications, and are usually linked to discourse-new information as simple juxtaposed clauses (though there is much variation in the structure and pragmatic functions of these constructions). Though the constructions contribute to discourse cohesion, their function is primarily poetic in nature. Furthermore, when Matsigenka speakers narrate the same myths in Spanish and in mixed Matsigenka-Spanish speech, they use the same kinds of linking constructions (which are otherwise uncommon in Spanish). Thus, the transfer of this kind of pattern from Matsigenka to Spanish is regimented by discourse genre, and offers an illustration of the cultural (i.e., metapragmatic) mediation of language contact.

1 Introduction

This chapter describes a type of recapitulative linkage used in Matsigenka myth narrations in a small, multiethnic community on the Andean-Amazonian agricultural frontier of Southern Peru. It also briefly presents the use of this construction in Spanish and mixed Matsigenka-Spanish myth narrations by the same speakers.



The most common form of the construction is as follows: a proposition is uttered (the reference clause, indicated in underlined text throughout this chapter), followed by a pause (indicated in brackets). Then, the proposition in the reference clause is recapitulated in the bridging clause (indicated in boldface text) and followed immediately by discourse-new information, usually in the form of a simple juxtaposed clause without any subordinating morphology. A simple Matsigenka example is given in (1):¹

- (1) a. *Impogini maika oaigake. [0.6]*
impogini maika o-a-ig-ak-i
 then now 3F-GO-PL-PFV-REAL
 ‘Then they went.’
- b. ***Oaigake*** *agaiganake oviarena.*
o-a-ig-ak-i o-ag-a-ig-an-ak-i o-piarena
 3F-GO-PL-PFV-REAL 3F-get-EP-PL-ABL-PFV-REAL 3F-gourd
 ‘They went (and) they got their gourds.’

These recapitulative linkages often express continuity between a single character’s simultaneous or immediately sequential actions (as in *oaigake* ‘they went’ in (1a) and *agaiganake oviarena* ‘they got their gourds’ in (1b)); for this reason, the recapitulated clause and the discourse-new clause usually have the same subject. However, there is substantial variation in the structure and pragmatic function of these constructions. For instance, in many cases the discourse-new information clarifies or elaborates the preceding proposition instead of offering a new one, and less frequently, the subject of the discourse-new clause is different from that of the recapitulated clause. More rarely, the recapitulated element does not contain a verb at all, but still follows the discursive patterns described here and thus must be considered part of the same phenomenon.

Among some speakers in the community, these linkages are employed very frequently in myth narrations – sometimes more than a dozen times over the course of a brief five- or ten-minute narrative, and many more times in longer narratives. The frequent use of these pause/repetition sequences to structure the events and introduce new information creates a particular kind of narrative rhythm that is a salient poetic characteristic of the myth narration discourse genre. The association between myth narrations and recapitulative linkages is so close that the one is rarely found without the other – even personal narratives about one’s own

¹Matsigenka morphemic analyses are adapted from Michael (2008) and Vargas Pereira & Vargas Pereira (2013).

2 The poetics of recapitulative linkage in Matsigenka

life or family history, which are similar in other respects to myth narrations, do not include them. Thus, while recapitulative linkages certainly contribute to discourse cohesion – a common function of such constructions (see Guérin & Aiton 2019 [this volume]) – their exclusive association with the myth narration discourse genre suggests that they should be understood primarily as a poetic or stylistic feature of that genre.

Linkage constructions similar to the kind described in this chapter (also known as head-tail linkages or tail-head linkages, among other terms) have been identified in a number of indigenous Amazonian languages, particularly in Western Amazonia. These include Cavineña (Guillaume 2011), Tariana (Aikhenvald 2002: 169–171), Yurakaré (van Gijn 2014), Aguaruna (Overall 2014), Murui (Wojtylak 2017: 515–522), and Ese Ejja (Vuillemermet 2017: 598–599). Note, however, that my analysis differs from these cases in focusing on the poetic function of such constructions in Matsigenka (and in both Spanish and mixed Matsigenka-Spanish speech). The ubiquity of linkage constructions across Western Amazonia suggests that they might be an areal phenomenon attributable to language contact (Seifart 2010: 916), as indeed we see in the transfer of such a construction from Eastern Tucanoan to Tariana in the Vaupés region (Aikhenvald 2002: 169–171). This would certainly be consistent with the proposal of Beier et al. (2002) that Amazonia constitutes a “discourse area,” in which particular ways of speaking have diffused broadly across languages and language families in that region (though this notion has usually been applied to contact between indigenous languages instead of between indigenous and European colonial languages). However, linkage constructions are a common enough discourse strategy among the languages of the world (for instance, in Papuan languages; see de Vries 2005) that it may be difficult to distinguish the effects of areal diffusion from chance except in very clear cases.

There is a more specific sense in which the Matsigenka linkage constructions discussed in this chapter are relevant to the topic of language contact – namely, that their regimentation by the myth narration discourse genre is what licenses their portability between languages (I use the linguistic anthropological senses of the terms *regimentation* and *discourse genre*; see Briggs & Bauman 1992; Silverstein 1993; and §2.2). As young Matsigenka-Spanish bilinguals in the community have taken up interest in myths, they have begun to perform such narrations in Spanish and in mixed Matsigenka-Spanish speech (though this is not as common as Matsigenka narrations). When this happens, they use the very same kinds of linkage constructions as in the Matsigenka narrations, even though this creates utterances that are considered unusual in Spanish (see §4). I argue that because

these recapitulative linkages are regimented by the local metapragmatic conventions of myth narration, they are also used when that discourse genre is invoked in a different lexico-grammatical code. In other words, since such linkages are understood to be part of a well executed myth performance, they are transferred to another language when speakers perceive themselves to be engaged in the same myth performance discourse genre in that language. While these Spanish and mixed Matsigenka-Spanish performances are not considered exemplary of Matsigenka verbal art, they often draw on other poetic conventions of Matsigenka myth performance as well, including (among others) the frequent use of ideophones, reported speech and special voices, and a common set of prosodic features and facial expressions for the indication of surprise, apprehension, and intensity. This case thus gives one example of how the effects of language contact can be culturally (i.e., metapragmatically) mediated. However, as I mentioned earlier, this case is different from the kind of inter-indigenous language contact commonly associated with an Amazonian discourse area. Furthermore, since myth narration is not practiced much among the younger generations, and since many Matsigenka speakers are shifting to Spanish, this contact feature is not likely to persist.

This chapter begins with an introduction to Matsigenka, Andean Spanish, and the discourse genre of myth narration on the Andean-Amazonian frontier of Southern Peru (§2.2). Then, in §3, I give a formal characterization of recapitulative linkages (§3.1), including relations between the reference clause and the bridging clause (§3.2), and the composition of the second discourse unit (§3.3). In §3.4, I discuss some atypical cases. Next, in §4, I go on to describe how the Matsigenka recapitulative linkages discussed thus far are borrowed in Spanish and mixed Matsigenka-Spanish performances of the same discourse genre. §5 offers some concluding comments.

2 Matsigenka, Spanish, and myth narration on the Andean-Amazonian frontier

2.1 Languages and communities

Matsigenka is an Arawak language, of the Kampan sub-group, spoken by a few thousand people in the Amazonian lowlands adjacent to the Southern Peruvian Andes (for more on the classification of Matsigenka, see Aikhenvald 1999; Michael 2008: 212–219; Michael 2010; and Payne 1981). Most speakers of Matsigenka have at least some exposure to Spanish, and many people in the Andean contact

zone (as in the community described in this chapter) also speak Southern Peruvian Quechua (Emlen 2017). Matsigenka is head-marking with a rich polysynthetic structure, and it uses verbal suffixes and enclitics, as well as a few prefixes and proclitics, for most of its grammatical functions. For more on the typological profile of the Kampan languages, see Michael (2008) and Mihás (2015). This chapter also discusses Andean Spanish, a set of contact varieties spoken by millions of people across Western South America. Andean Spanish features notable phonological and structural influence from Quechua (for more, see Adelaar & Muysken 2004: 593–595; Babel 2018; Cerrón-Palomino 2001; Escobar 2003). For more information about the heterogeneous forms of Spanish in this area, see Emlen (2019).

The community where these recordings were made occupies a small, remote hillside in the Alto Urubamba Valley of Southern Peru, part of traditional Matsigenka territory that abuts the Andes. This region has been a conduit for the movement of goods, people, and languages between the Andes and Amazonia since the Inka period and likely long before (Gade 1972; Camino 1977). Today the Alto Urubamba is an agricultural frontier, and as the road network has expanded into Amazonia since the 1950s, tens of thousands of Quechua-speaking migrants from the Andes have come to Matsigenka territory in search of land for the cultivation of coffee and other tropical crops. This migratory wave has displaced many Matsigenka people to remote corners of the valley, while others have intermarried with Andean settlers and joined the multiethnic agrarian society.

The community where this research was conducted came together in the 1980s and 1990s through the intermarriage of Matsigenka people from across the region and Andean settlers from the nearby highlands. These people come from a wide variety of sociolinguistic backgrounds, and many are trilingual in Matsigenka, Quechua, and Spanish. Matsigenka and Quechua are associated with domestic life and kin relations (depending on the family background), while Quechua is used in interactions relating to the coffee economy and rural agrarian society. Spanish is the language of the community's political and institutional life. Most people can speak, or at least understand, all three languages. For more about how the three languages are used in the community, see Emlen (2014; 2015; 2017).

2.2 Myth narration

Myth narration is one of many locally recognized discourse genres in the community. I mean the term *discourse genre* both in the formal sense of “constellations of co-occurrent formal elements and structures that define or characterize particular classes of utterances” (Briggs & Bauman 1992: 141), and in the metapragmatic

sense of culturally constructed “orienting frameworks, interpretive procedures, and sets of expectations” (Hanks 1987: 670) that regiment the production and interpretation of speech (see also Bakhtin 1986; Silverstein 1993).

Myth narration is something of a specialized discursive skill in the community, and the oldest members who grew up beyond the coffee frontier and the Dominican missionary sphere are considered to be its most authoritative performers. These performances are usually relatively monologic, unlike in other places where they tend to be more dialogic (e.g., among speakers of the nearby and closely related Nanti language; Michael 2008: 44). This is due in part to the fact that many young Matsigenka speakers are shifting to Spanish and Quechua and are increasingly directing their attention to the rural agrarian social world instead of the cultural practices of their parents and grandparents. The performances usually take place at the home in the evening, and can last for hours, depending on the stamina and skill of the speaker and the engagement of the audience. Others are briefer, and last only a few minutes. The best performances (as judged by local metapragmatic standards) are quite long, feature virtuosic displays of creativity and improvisation, and are “keyed” (see Goffman 1974; Bauman 1977) – that is, signaled as instances of a particular discourse genre – by special formal and narrative features. These features include frequent ideophones and other iconic phenomena, reported speech (often with special voices), a particular set of prosodic features and facial expressions, cameos by characters from other myths that create intertextual links across the dense web of Matsigenka cosmology, and the kind of narrative rhythm that emerges from the frequent use of the bridging constructions discussed here. Matsigenka myth narration in the community has come to be constructed around a language ideology that conceives of such discourse as an exemplary model (Kroskrity 1998) of traditional Matsigenka language, culture, and knowledge, and it is generally subject to a regime of purism in which code-switching is discouraged (a fact that distinguishes it from all other domains of Matsigenka language use in the community).

However, during my field work in 2009–2012, Matsigenka myths were occasionally performed in Spanish and in mixed Matsigenka-Spanish speech, particularly by younger people who were interested in traditional Matsigenka culture and were not deterred by the ideology of linguistic purism. These narrations usually came with disclaimers about their non-authoritativeness, and tended to offer a brief, *just the facts* versions of the stories rather than the kind of lengthy, virtuosic performances described above. Some of these Spanish and mixed Matsigenka-Spanish performances were given upon my request (sometimes to the puzzled amusement of older and more authoritative narrators), but many speakers also performed them among their friends and families, and in

2 *The poetics of recapitulative linkage in Matsigenka*

spaces of explicit cultural exposition such as community festivals and visits from municipal officials. Note that I never witnessed or successfully elicited a Matsigenka myth in Quechua, a language that is associated with a different tradition of verbal art, and that is understood by the local ideologies of language to be incompatible with explicit expressions of Matsigenka culture. This is part of a larger tension in the conflicted and contested space of the agricultural frontier, where Quechua and Matsigenka are connected to opposite sides of an ethnically-inflected struggle over land and legitimacy, and where Spanish represents a (relatively) unmarked common ground (see Emlen 2015; 2017).

Most Matsigenka myths tell a story of “cosmological transformism” (Viveiros de Castro 1998: 471), an ontological principle common in indigenous South American societies by which many animals, plants, and supernatural beings were once human before taking their current form, in which they now retain their essentially human subjectivity. This phenomenon has been described among Matsigenka people by Rosengren (2006) and Johnson (2003), among others. These are origin stories, but since the moment of transformation often hinges on a moral transgression of one or another character in the myth, they also serve as “morality tales” (Johnson 2003: 118–124, 220) that warn Matsigenka speakers about particular types of dangerous emotions or behavior (Izquierdo & Johnson 2007; Johnson 1999; Rosengren 2000; Shepard 2002). Matsigenka stories have been collected in translation and in Matsigenka by anthropologists (e.g., Baer 1994; Renard-Casevitz & Pacaia 1981; Renard-Casevitz 1981) and by missionaries (e.g., de Cenitagoya 1944; Davis & Snell 1999[1968]), usually as source of information regarding Matsigenka culture and ontology rather than as a representation of the language and verbal art *per se*. However, a thorough recent compilation of 170 written Matsigenka texts (Vargas Pereira & Vargas Pereira 2013) gives a closer look at Matsigenka linguistic structure and the verbal artistry associated with myths, as well as a rich perspective on Matsigenka culture. However, those myths do not appear to exhibit the recapitulative linkages discussed in this chapter, either because of the particular sociolinguistic circumstances of the narrators, or because those myths were collected in written rather than oral form.

The data used in this chapter come from audio and video recordings of 35 myth narrations in the community, performed by seven people from a range of different ages and sociolinguistic backgrounds. These were collected over the course of 19 months of field work in 2009–2012. Additionally, 11 myth performances from speakers in five other communities in the Alto Urubamba were included in the corpus as a basis of regional comparison; however, only data from the community of focus are presented in this chapter. Some myths were told for me in my house, while others were recorded in the narrators’ homes as they performed the

myths for their families. Several recordings were also made by Matsigenka speakers themselves, whom I had trained to use the equipment in my absence. The use of the bridging constructions appears to be consistent across these contexts, and does not vary by the age or gender of the narrator. The 35 performances each ranged from several minutes to nearly an hour in length, and I identified a total of around 300 bridging constructions in the myth corpus. Note that these constructions also appear, using the same structures and in roughly the same frequency, in my recordings from across the Alto Urubamba, though I do not know how widespread they are beyond that region. For instance, bridging constructions following this pattern do not appear in Nanti (Lev Michael, p.c.) nor in Caquinte (Zachary O'Hagan, p.c.), two of the nearest Arawak languages, and I have not noted similar constructions in the local variety of Quechua.

2.3 Recapitulative linkages in myth narrations

By way of an example of bridging constructions in Matsigenka myth performances, consider a passage from the *pakitsa* 'harpy eagle' myth, told in November 2011 by one of the community's most authoritative practitioners of Matsigenka verbal art. She told the story one evening to me and several of her family members, and it featured all of the elements of virtuosic performance mentioned above. In this sequence the *pakitsa* 'harpy eagle,' who had recently been transformed from a man into an eagle, swoops down upon the house of his human wife, daughter, and son (the man mentioned in 2a). He snatches up his daughter, who had been walking around outside the house, and carries her off to his nest across the river. The sequence contains two bridging constructions, in (2) and (3). The passages in (2) and (3) are directly sequential in the narrative.

The narrator first sets the tone of this scene in (2a) by describing the mother, who is occupied by routine domestic work inside the house and is unaware of the fate that is about to befall her daughter. In (2b), this context is restated in the bridging clause and linked to a description of the daughter's vulnerable position outside the house (note that this case is unusual in linking clauses with different subjects). In this case, the bridging construction serves to express the simultaneous unwitting actions of the mother and the daughter, a calm scene that will be interrupted by the violent arrival of the *pakitsa* in (3).

- (2) a. *Impogini otarogavagetake iroro oga irotyo iriniro yoga matsigenka.* [1.1]
impogini o-tarog-a-vage-t-ak-i iroro o-oga iro-tyo
then 3F-SWEEP-EP-DUR-EP-PFV-REAL she 3F-that she-AFFECT

iriniro i-oga matsigenka

his.mother 3M-THAT person

‘Then she was sweeping, she, the mother of the man.’

- b. ***Impogini otarogavageti***, *inti oshinto anuvagetakeroka oga oga sotsiku*. [1.0]

impogini o-tarog-a-vage-t-i

i-nti o-oga o-shinto

then 3F-SWEEP-EP-DUR-EP-REAL 3M-COP 3F-that 3F-daughter

o-anu-vage-t-ak-i-roka

o-oga o-oga sotsi-ku

3F-walk-DUR-EU-PFV-REAL-EPIS.WK 3F-that 3F-that outside-LOC

‘Then she was sweeping, [and] her daughter must have been walking around, um, outside.’

Then, in (3), the eagle-man dives in and grabs his daughter, an abrupt turn of events that the narrator punctuates with a stark and deliberate 1.3 second pause. Once this development has been introduced, the narrator restates it in the bridging clause in (3b) and links it to the *pakitsa*’s next act of carrying the girl across the river to his nest. Both events are related as witnessed by the mother, which invites the listeners to contemplate the horror of such an experience. In (3), the bridging construction allows the eagle-man’s sudden attack to stand alone in dramatic tension before it is restated to express continuity with the girl’s removal to the nest.

- (3) a. ***Okemiri maika yarapaake yagapanutiro pe oga oshinto otyomiani***. [1.3]

o-kem-i-ri maika i-ar-apa-ak-i

3F-listen-REAL-3M NOW 3M-fly-ALL-PFV-REAL

i-ag-apanu-t-i-ro pe o-oga o-shinto o-tyomia-ni

3M-get-DIR:DEP-EP-REAL-3F EMPH 3M-that 3F-daughter 3F-small-ANIM

‘She heard him [as] he flew in and he grabbed her young daughter.’

- b. ***Yagapanutiro***, *opampogiavakeri koa yarakaganake anta yovetsikakera ivanko intati anta*.

i-ag-apanu-t-i-ro o-pampogi-av-ak-i-ri koa

3M-get-DIR:DEP-EP-REAL-3F 3F-watch-TR-PFV-REAL-3M more

i-ar-akag-an-ak-i anta i-ovetsik-ak-i-ra i-panko

3M-fly-CAUS-ABL-PFV-REAL there 3M-make-PFV-REAL-SBD 3M-house

intati anta

other.side there

‘He grabbed her, [as] [the mother] watched him, [and] he quickly

flew her away to where he had made his house on the other side [of the river].’

The effect of these constructions is to establish a narrative rhythm through which the plot unfolds and information is introduced and elaborated (for another extended example, see (13) below). This rhythm creates tension, suspense, and surprise in the narrative, and (in the best performances) holds the listeners in rapt attention. In some myth narrations these bridging constructions appear between every two or three clauses – sometimes twice a minute or more – and this narrative rhythm is only heard within such performances. Note that these constructions are not communicatively necessary, strictly speaking, for the functional purposes of discourse cohesion; indeed, the discourse would be perfectly intelligible and easy to follow without them. Instead, these bridging constructions are oriented toward the poetic function of language, which, by Jakobson’s definition (1960), prioritizes the form of the message above its purely referential ends (particularly through the co-occurrence of formal features in a given stretch of discourse). Thus, this analysis follows the long linguistic anthropological tradition of research on verbal art and ethnopoetics (Bauman 1977; Hymes 1981; for a recent review, see Webster & Kroskrity 2013).

3 Formal characterization

3.1 Basic template

This section gives a formal characterization of recapitulative linkages in Matsigenka myth performances in the Andean-Amazonian frontier community. The basic template for these constructions is given in (4):

- (4) [...[Reference clause]]_{discourse unit}
[0.5–4.0 second pause]
[[Bridging clause] [Discourse-new information]]_{discourse unit}

Here, discourse units are understood as stretches of discourse that present particular events in the narrative, and that are marked off by pauses and special intonational contours. In addition to a 0.5–4.0 second pause between the discourse units, speakers sometimes utter a validating *mmhmm* or *aha*, as in (5), and in (12) below. These pauses are seen as appropriate moments for backchannel. In

some of the recordings in the corpus that were made by native speakers of Matsigenka themselves, a listener supplied the validating *mmhmm* or *aha* instead of the narrator (however, there are no cases in my data in which a listener repeats a reference clause). The example in (5) is from a different speaker's performance of the *pakitsa* 'harpy eagle' myth, and refers to the same events in (2) and (3) above. Note that the emphatic particle *pe* in (5a) comes from Andean Spanish (for more, see §4).

- (5) a. *Yamanakero pe*. [2.4]
i-am-an-ak-i-ro *pe*
 3M-carry-ABL-PFV-REAL-3F EMPH
 'He carried her away.'
- b. *mmhmm*. [0.5]
- c. *Yamanakero imenkotakara imperitaku*.
i-am-an-ak-i-ro *i-menko-t-ak-a-ra*
 3M-carry-ABL-PFV-REAL-3F 3M-make.nest-EP-PFV-REAL-SBD
imperita-ku
 cliff-LOC
 'He carried her away [to] where he had made his nest in the cliff.'

In addition to bridging constructions that take place in the narrator's voice, the phenomenon also appears in the reported speech of characters in the narrative, as in (6):

- (6) a. *Okantiro maika, "noshinto, gaigakite nia."* [1.1]
o-kant-i-ro *maika no-shinto* *n-ag-a-ig-aki-t-e*
 3F-say-REAL-3F NOW 1-daughter IRR-get-EP-PL-TRNLOC.PFV-EP-IRR
nia
 water
 'She said to her, "my daughter[s], go get water."'
- b. *"Gaigakite nia maika nontinkakera ovuroki."*
n-ag-a-ig-aki-t-e *nia maika*
 IRR-get-EP-PL-TRNLOC.PFV-EP-IRR water now
no-n-tink-ak-e-ra *ovuroki*
 1-IRR-mash-PFV-IRR-SBD masato
 "Go get water, I'm going to mash up masato."

Within the template given in (4), bridging constructions can take a variety of forms. Linkages between the reference clause and the bridging clause are discussed in §3.2; relationships between the bridging clause and the discourse-new information in the second discourse unit are discussed in §3.3; and some atypical cases are described in §3.4.

3.2 Reference clause/bridging clause relations

Before discussing the relationship between the reference clause and the bridging clause, it is necessary to first characterize typical reference clauses. These units are usually simple clauses (e.g., *oaigake* ‘they went’ in 1a). However, it bears mentioning that in some cases, the reference unit itself is a more complex construction, as in the example in (7). This case comprises a reference unit of two juxtaposed clauses (7a) that are both repeated verbatim in the bridging clause (7b). Such juxtapositions are common in Matsigenka (see §3.3).

- (7) a. *Agake omonkigakero*. [1.4]
o-ag-ak-i *o-monkig-ak-i-ro*
 3F-get-PFV-REAL 3F-carry.in.clothing-PFV-REAL-3F
 ‘She caught [it] [and] carried it in her cushma.’
- b. *Agake omonkigakero sokaitakero oga shitatsiku...*
o-ag-ak-i *o-monkig-ak-i-ro*
 3F-get-PFV-REAL 3F-carry.in.clothing-PFV-REAL-3F
sokai-t-ak-i-ro *o-oga shitatsi-ku*
 dump.out-EP-PFV-REAL-3F 3F-that mat-LOC
 ‘She caught [it] [and] carried it [in her cushma], [and then] she dumped it out onto the mat..’

Bridging clauses are usually verbatim repetitions of the reference clause – that is, *recapitulative linkages* – as in (7) and in most of the other examples given in this chapter. Summary linkages, in which the reference clause is referred to anaphorically with a summarizing verb rather than repeated (Guérin & Aiton 2019 [this volume]), do not appear. This is apparently because the construction’s poetic function is built on repetition. However, in some cases the bridging clause presents a modified order or form of the information, or information is omitted, added, or substituted. For instance, in the passage from the first *pakitsa* ‘harpy eagle’ myth given in (2) and (3) above, the reference clause *yagapanutiro pe oga oshintoto tyomiani* ‘he grabbed her young daughter’ (3a), with its full direct object

noun phrase, is shortened to *yagapanutiro* ‘he grabbed her’ (3b). Similarly, in (8) the adverbial *inkenishiku* ‘in the forest’ in the reference clause is omitted in the bridging clause:

- (8) a. *Iaigake imagavageigi inkenishiku*. [2.0]
i-a-ig-ak-i *i-mag-a-vage-ig-i* *inkenishi-ku*
 3M-go-PL-PFV-REAL 3M-sleep-EP-DUR-PL-REAL forest-LOC
 ‘They went [and] they slept in the forest.’
- b. *Imagavageigi ipokaigai okutagitanake ikantiri* “*tsame*”...
i-mag-a-vage-ig-i *i-pok-a-ig-a-i*
 3M-sleep-EP-DUR-PL-REAL 3M-come-EP-PL-DIR:REG-REAL
o-kutagite-t-an-ak-i *i-kant-i-ri* *tsame*
 3F-be.dawn-EP-ABL-PFV-REAL 3M-say-REAL-3M go.HORT
 ‘They slept [and then] they came back the next day, and he said to him, “let’s go.”’

Some information is omitted in the bridging clauses in (3b) and (8b), though they both retain enough similarity to the reference clauses to serve the poetic function of repetition. Similarly, in (9), the Spanish reportative evidential particle *dice* in the reference clause is omitted in the bridging clause, because it is unnecessary to mark the evidential status of the same information more than once in the same stretch of discourse (for a similar case in Sunwar, see Schulze & Bieri 1973: 392).²

- (9) a. *Itentaigari dice*. [1.8]
i-tent-a-ig-a-ri *dice*
 3M-accompany-EP-PL-REAL-3M EVID.REP
 ‘He brought him along, they say.’
- b. *Itentaigari ya itasonkake...*
i-tent-a-ig-a-ri *ya* *i-tasonk-ak-i*
 3M-accompany-EP-PL-REAL-3M at.that.point 3M-blow.on-PFV-REAL
 ‘He brought him along, and then he blew [on him]...’

A case of substitution can be seen in the Spanish example in (15) below, whereby the reference clause *sigue caminando* ‘she kept walking’ is restated in the

²This reportative evidential particle, which has been borrowed from Spanish into Matsigenka in some parts of the Alto Urubamba, is common in some varieties of Andean Spanish (as well as its variant *dizque*; see Babel 2009).

bridging clause as *sigue avanzando* ‘she kept moving forward’. Such lexical substitutions, however, are uncommon.

3.3 Relations within the second discourse unit

Relations within the second discourse unit – that is, between the bridging clause and the discourse-new information that follows it – can take a number of forms. As discussed above, the second discourse unit often expresses simultaneity or immediate temporal continuity between the action in the reference/bridging clause and a discourse-new proposition, as in ‘he flew away’ and ‘he went into the forest in order to hunt’ in (10):

- (10) a. *Oneiri yaranake.* [2.1]
o-ne-i-ri i-ar-an-ak-i
3F-see-REAL-3M 3M-fly-ABL-PFV-REAL
‘She saw him [as] he flew away.’
- b. *Yaranake iatake inkenishiku anta inkovintsatera iriro aikiro irityo pakitsa.*
i-ar-an-ak-i i-a-t-ak-i inkenishi-ku anta
3M-fly-ABL-PFV-REAL 3M-go-EP-PFV-REAL forest-LOC there
i-n-kovintsa-t-e-ra iriro aikiro iri-tyo pakitsa
3M-IRR-hunt-EP-IRR-SBD he also he-AFFECT harpy.eagle
‘He flew away [and] went into the forest in order to hunt, the harpy eagle too.’

Often, the bridging clause and discourse-new clause are simply linked as juxtaposed (or apposite) clauses, with no subordinating morphology. This is a common means of clause-linking in Matsigenka and other Kampan languages (e.g., Michael 2008: 435). This can be seen in several of the examples given so far, including (10b).

The expression of continuity and immediate temporal succession between two actions most often refers to the actions of a single character; for this reason, the subject of the reference/bridging clause and the subject of the discourse-new clause in the second discourse unit are usually the same. However, speakers sometimes express such a link between the actions of two different characters, as in sentence (3a) above: *impogini otarogavageti, inti oga oshintu anuvage-takeroka oga oga sotsiku* ‘Then she was sweeping, [and] her daughter must have been walking around, um, outside’. Matsigenka does not mark switch reference

morphologically, and the change in subjects is simply expressed through person marking.

But while the Matsigenka bridging constructions described here usually express continuity and quick temporal succession between two actions, in other cases the discourse following the bridging clause instead offers an additional clarification or elaboration of the first action. For instance, in example (11), the discourse-new information in the second discourse unit is the reported utterance *ipokai piri* ‘your father came back’ (11c), which clarifies what one man called out to another man in the reference clause (11a):

- (11) a. *Ikaemakotapaakeri*. [1.8]
i-kaem-ako-t-apa-ak-i-ri
 3M-call-APPL-EP-ALL-PFV-REAL-3M
 ‘He called out to him.’
- b. *mmhmm*. [0.3]
- c. *Ikaemakotapaakeri* “*ipokai piri*.”
i-kaem-ako-t-apa-ak-i-ri *i-pok-a-i* *piri*
 3M-call-APPL-EP-ALL-PFV-REAL-3M 3M-COME-DIR:REG-REAL your.father
 ‘He called out to him, “your father came back.”’

Similarly, in (5) discussed above, the clause *yamanakero* ‘he carried her away’ (5a) is clarified by the additional discourse-new information *imenkotakara imperitaku* ‘[to] where he had made his nest in the cliff’ (5c), marked with the subordinator *-ra*. In such cases, the discourse-new information is linked to the reference/bridging clauses through a broader range of constructions than just the simple juxtapositions described above; however, this is less common.

3.4 Some atypical cases

It is important to note here two related variations of this poetic phenomenon that do not fall under the category of inter-clausal bridging constructions *per se*. First, in some cases a reference clause is simply repeated in a second discourse unit, within the same stylistic parameters described above, but is not linked to any discourse-new information at all, as in (12). Such cases are therefore not bridging construction at all, but since they follow the same poetic structure, they thus must be considered in the same analysis. Note that the second discourse unit (12b) differs from the reference clause (12a) only by fronting the object, creating a pre-verbal focus construction (Michael 2008: 385).

- (12) a. Yagaigake aryopaturika chakopi. [1.3]
i-ag-a-ig-ak-i *aryopaturika chakopi*
 3M-grab-EP-PL-PFV-REAL large.(sheaf) arrow
 ‘They grabbed a big sheaf of arrows.’
- b. Aryopaturika chakopi yagaigake.
aryopaturika chakopi i-ag-a-ig-ak-i
 large.(sheaf) arrow 3M-grab-EP-PL-PFV-REAL
 ‘A big sheaf of arrows, they grabbed.’

A second variation is a kind of construction in which the reference unit does not contain a verb at all, but is still an instance of the same poetic pattern discussed in this chapter. For instance, passage (13) includes an ideophone *kong kong* ‘whistle sound’ that serves as a reference unit linking (13a) and (13c). The linkage in (13c) reestablishes the flow of the narrative after it is interrupted by a clarifying digression in (13b). Note that the bridging discourse unit is followed by another, canonical bridging construction (13c and 13d).

- (13) a. Okemake isonkavatapaake kong kong. [1.0]
o-kem-ak-i *i-sonkava-t-apa-ak-i* *kong*
 3F-hear-PFV-REAL 3M-whistle-EP-ALL-PFV-REAL whistle.sound
kong
 whistle.sound
 ‘She heard him whistle, kong kong.’
- b. Tera iravise ampa ipokapaake aka pankotsiku. [3.6]
tera *i-r-avis-e* *ampa* *i-pok-apa-ak-i* *aka*
 NEG-REAL 3M-IRR-approach-IRR bit.by.bit 3M-come-ALL-PFV-REAL here
panko-tsi-ku
 house-ALIEN-LOC
 ‘He didn’t approach [the house], he came slowly to the house.’
- c. Kong kong yogonketapaaka. [2.4]
kong *kong* *i-ogonke-t-apa-ak-a*
 whistle.sound whistle.sound 3M-arrive-EP-ALL-PFV-REAL
 ‘Kong kong, [and] he arrived.’
- d. Yogonketapaaka ikaemakotapaakero.
i-ogonke-t-apa-ak-a *i-kaem-ako-t-apa-ak-i-ro*
 3M-arrive-EP-ALL-PFV-REAL 3M-call-APPL-EP-ALL-PFV-REAL-3F
 ‘He arrived [and] he called out to her.’

4 Spanish and mixed Spanish-Matsigenka speech

As I discussed in §2, Matsigenka myths are usually performed in Matsigenka with very little code-switching in Spanish (though a number of other Spanish discourse features, including the reportative evidential particle *dice* (9a), and the emphatic particle *pues* or *pe* (3a), (5a), often pass below the threshold of a speaker's awareness). However, because of the community's complex sociolinguistic constitution, ongoing language shift, and uneven distribution of discursive skills, the narration of Matsigenka myths in Spanish or in mixed Matsigenka-Spanish speech has become more common. This is particularly true among young people who wish to engage with traditional Matsigenka culture, but who do not feel that they possess the requisite Matsigenka language competence. These performances are strictly distinguished from the monolingual Matsigenka performances discussed so far in this chapter, which are considered authoritative and culturally exemplary.

What is interesting about these Spanish and mixed Spanish-Matsigenka performances is that they usually employ the same poetic and stylistic features that “key” the discourse genre of Matsigenka myth performance (in the sense of Goffman 1974), including ideophones, prosodic and facial expressions, reported speech, and bridging linkages. That is, once a narrator “breaks through” into full performance (Hymes 1975), the metapragmatic conventions of Matsigenka myth narration – that is, the local cultural expectations about what makes a “good story” – can be applied in Spanish as well.

For instance, consider the mixed Matsigenka-Spanish example in (14). This young narrator acquired a great deal of cultural information while listening to his mother perform Matsigenka myths over the course of his childhood, and he enjoys listening to such performances for hours on end; but while he cares deeply about Matsigenka stories, he is not comfortable performing them entirely in Matsigenka. He recorded himself recounting the story of the *oshetoniro* demon to his wife one evening in their home while I rested outside:

- (14) a. *Al medio se ha ido la canoa y se ha hundido pe ese oshetoniro.* [1.3]
al medio se ha ido
 PREP+DET.DEF.M.SG center REFL have.3SG.PRS go.PST.PTCP
la canoa y se ha hundido pe
 DET.DEF.F.SG canoe and REFL have.3SG.PRS sink.PST.PTCP EMPH
ese oshetoniro
 that.ADJ.DEM.M.SG oshetoniro.demon
 ‘The canoe went out into the center (of the river) and that oshetoniro demon sank.’

- b. ***Se ha hundido pe mataka ya está maika yokaataka.***
se ha hundido pe mataka ya está
 REFL have.3SG.PRS sink.PST.PTCP EMPH that's.it already be.3SG.PRS
maika i-okaa-t-ak-a
 now 3M-drown-EP-PFV-REAL
 'He sank, that's it, that's it, he drowned.'

Here, the reference clause in (14a), *se ha hundido pe ese oshetoniro* 'that oshetoniro demon sank', is in Spanish (except for the name of the demon itself), and it is recapitulated in the bridging clause with the subject omitted: *se ha hundido pe* 'he sank'. The code switch to Matsigenka appears at the beginning of the discourse-new information in the second discourse unit in (14b) (*mataka ya está maika yokaataka* 'that's it, that's it, he drowned'), directly after the bridging clause. It is significant that the reference clause and the bridging clause are the parts of the discourse that coincide in language choice: the poetic function of the constructions discussed in this chapter depends on the latter's similarity with the former, so we would expect them to be in the same language. It is not until immediately after the repetition of the reference clause that the narrator switches to Matsigenka.

Another example comes from a performance by the same man's wife (15):

- (15) a. *Sigue caminando.* [2.1]
sigue caminando
 continue.3SG.PRS walk.PRS.PTCP
 'She kept walking.'
- b. ***Sigue avanzando oneapaakeri timashitake grande ya pe imaarane.***
sigue avanzando o-ne-apa-ak-i-ri
 continue.3SG.PRS go.forward.PRS.PTCP 3F-see-ALL-PFV-REAL-3M
timashi-t-ak-i grande ya pe i-maarane
 sneak.up.on-EP-PFV-REAL big already EMPH M-big
 'She kept going forward [and] she saw [it] sneaking up on her, a big one, a really big one.'

Again here, the code switch from Spanish to Matsigenka in (15b) takes place after the reference clause is recapitulated in the bridging clause, with the introduction of the discourse-new information. Note also that just as in most of the Matsigenka examples given so far, the two propositions in the second discourse unit are linked as simple juxtaposed clauses (*sigue avanzando oneapaakeri* 'She kept going forward [and] she saw [it]'), which would be considered unusual in

Spanish. However, unlike in (14), the verb *caminar* ‘to walk’ in the reference clause is substituted with the verb *avanzar* ‘to go forward’. This substitution, in a parallel construction following *sigue...* ‘she kept...’, was similar enough to serve the poetic purposes of the linkage.³

In addition to these examples of bridging linkages that feature Matsigenka-Spanish code-switching, we also find examples in myths performed entirely in Spanish. For instance, one woman told a story to a group of family members, children, and visitors who did not speak Matsigenka (16):

- (16) a. *La había cogido y la había tetado.* [0.9]
la *había* *cogido* *y* *la*
 her.PN.OBJ.F.3SG have.3SG.PST pick.up.PST.PTCP and her.PN.OBJ.F.3SG
había *tetado*
 have.3SG.PST nurse.PST.PTCP
 ‘She picked up [the baby] and she nursed her.’
- b. *La había tetado entonces la ha empezado a coger...*
la *había* *tetado* *entonces* *la*
 her.PN.OBJ.F.3SG have.3SG.PST nurse.PST.PTCP then it.PN.OBJ.F.3SG
ha *empezado* *a* *coger*
 have.3SG.PRS begin.PST.PTCP TO take.INF
 ‘She nursed her, and then [the baby] began to take [the breast]...’

As in many of the examples given so far in this chapter, the reference clause in (16a) is repeated verbatim in the bridging clause; however, in this case the bridging clause is linked to the discourse-new information in the second discourse unit (16b) by a conjunction *entonces* ‘then’, a more familiar construction in Spanish than the simple juxtaposed clauses above. As in other cases throughout this chapter, the reference clause in (16a) was produced with falling intonation, and the bridging clause was produced with rising intonation to signal that the proposition would be followed by discourse-new information.

Another example from a Spanish performance of a Matsigenka myth comes from the same narrator (17). More information about the variety of Andean Spanish spoken in the community is available in Emlen (2019).

- (17) a. *Así se habrá echado pues así, y de su pie le ha empezado a tragarle pe.*
 [1.0]
así *se* *habrá* *echado* *pues* *así*
 like.that self.PN.REFL.3 have.3SG.FUT lie.down.PST.PTCP EMPH like.that

³When Matsigenka/Spanish bilinguals speak Spanish, they often use present tense marking to express past events.

y de su pie le ha empezado a
and from her foot him.PN.OBL.3SG have.3SG.PRS begin.PST.PTCP to
tragarle pe
swallow.INF+PN.3SG EMPH

‘She must have laid down like that, and it began swallowing her from her foot.’

- b. *De su pie le ha empezado a tragar, ha llegado hasta acá.*

de su pie le ha empezado a
from her foot him.PN.OBL.3SG have.3SG.PRS begin.PST.PTCP to
tragar ha llegado hasta acá
swallow.INF have.3SG.PRS arrive.PST.PTCP until here

‘It began swallowing her from her foot, [and] it got this far.’ [Points to leg with finger.]

Here, the reference clause in (17a) is repeated nearly verbatim in (17b), with the exception of the emphatic particle *pe*, which is omitted in the bridging clause, and the object enclitic *le* ‘her’ at the end of the infinitive verb *tragar* ‘to swallow’. However, in this case the speaker does not use a conjunction between the bridging clause and the discourse-new information, but rather uses the typically Matsigenka juxtaposed verb construction in (17b).

5 Conclusion

This chapter presented a type of bridging construction that is ubiquitous in the narration of Matsigenka myths in a small community on the Andean-Amazonian agricultural frontier of Southern Peru. The construction appears primarily in Matsigenka language discourse, but it is also heard in Spanish and in mixed Spanish-Matsigenka performances of the same genre. While these constructions surely contribute to discourse cohesion, they must be understood primarily as a poetic feature distinctive to the discourse genre of myth narration.

The fact that these constructions are a property of the myth narration discourse genre – rather than of a particular lexico-grammatical code – means that they can be transferred from one language to another (in this case, Spanish) when that genre is invoked. In fact, they must be transferred, to the extent that they are considered by the local metapragmatic standards to be an essential part of successful myth performance. In other words, because these constructions are limited to the genre of myth narration but cross-cut languages, they should be understood not as a property of the Matsigenka language per se, but rather of the

myth narration discourse genre – which may also cross-cut languages. The fact that the metapragmatic regimentation of discourse genres enables the circulation of features across languages shows how discourse areas might emerge from local cultures of language (as in Amazonia; Beier et al. 2002), and it also illustrates how contact-induced language change can be mediated by locally meaningful categories of discursive behavior (i.e., ‘culture’; Silverstein 1976). This case thus supports the proposition that *language contact is culturally mediated*. However, this contact effect is only as stable as the community’s multilingualism, and it will likely not long outlast the language shift from Matsigenka to Spanish currently under way in the community.

Appendix

Excerpt of Pakitsa (Harpy Eagle) story, Alto Urubamba Matsigenka, November 2011. Analyzed by Nicholas Q. Emlen and Julio Korinti Piñarreal.

This narration of the Matsigenka *pakitsa* ‘harpy eagle’ story was recorded in November 2011 in the Alto Urubamba region of Southern Peru. The narrator (whose name is withheld per the arrangement with the community) grew up speaking Matsigenka and, to a lesser degree, Spanish. She lived in various places across the Alto Urubamba Valley as Quechua-speaking coffee farmers gradually colonized the region since the 1950s, and she lived for a brief time as an adult in a nearby Dominican mission. More information about this history and sociolinguistic situation can be found in Emlen (2014; 2015; 2017; 2019).

The *pakitsa* story is popular across the region, and deals with themes of incest and cannibalism. The harpy eagle is a renowned hunter, which is a recurrent part of this story. A summary of this version of the story is excerpted from Emlen (2014: 255–256): “a man requests fermented yuca beer from his wife before going out to burn his *chacra* for planting. However, the night before his son had had a dream that his father would become too drunk and be killed in the fire, so he warned his mother not to give him too much beer. But the man drank too much and was burned up in the fire. The son reprimanded his mother and instructed her to wake him up if the man appeared at the door of the house during the night – his body would be composed of ash, and a small amount of water would restore him. When the man appeared, the mother did not wake up her son, but rather threw an excessive quantity of water on her husband, disintegrating him into a puddle of ash on the ground. The ash that remained became the *pakitsa* ‘harpy eagle’ (with its distinctive puffy, ash-like white feathers around its neck).”

The excerpt below picks up at this point in the story. Here, the *pakitsa*-man abducted his daughter and impregnated her. After this excerpt, Emlen (2014: 256) continues, the man and his daughter “lived together in his nest and became cannibals. The *pakitsa*-man was eventually killed while hunting for humans, and upon hearing of his death, his daughter ate their newborn son and disappeared into a river to join the mythical tribe of cannibalistic female *maimeroite* warriors.”

The story, which lasted about sixteen minutes in total, was considered an exemplary instance of myth narration. Recapitulative linkages are indicated with underlined and bolded text, as in the accompanying chapter. The morpheme glossing conventions mostly follow Vargas Pereira & Vargas Pereira (2013), which is the most complete accounting of Alto Urubamba Matsigenka morphology to date. However, a full descriptive grammar of Matsigenka remains to be written, and some of the morphemic analyses are preliminary.

- (A1) *Impo ikimotanake yoga pakitsa aryompa aryompa yantavankitanake.*

impo i-kimo-t-an-ak-i *i-oga pakitsa aryompa*
 then 3M-grow-EP-ABL-PFV-REAL 3M-that harpy.eagle gradually
aryompa i-anta-vanki-t-an-ak-i
 gradually 3M-mature-NI:wing-EP-ABL-PFV-REAL

‘Then the eagle grew bit by bit, [and] his wings matured.’

- (A2) *Impogini maika iatake ikovintsavagetakera otomi anta iaigake yanuvageigakitira.*

impogini maika i-a-t-ak-i *i-kovintsa-vage-t-ak-i-ra*
 then now 3M-go-EP-PFV-REAL 3M-hunt-DUR-EP-PFV-REAL-SBD
o-tomi anta i-a-ig-ak-i
 3F-son there 3M-go-PL-PFV-REAL
i-anu-vage-ig-aki-t-i-ra
 3M-walk-DUR-PL-ASSOC.MOT:DIST-EP-REAL-SBD

‘Then her sons went to hunt, they went on hunting trips.’

- (A3) *Iatake yagaigi komaginaro inti iriro kishiatanatsi anta pankotsiku.*

i-a-t-ak-i *i-ag-a-ig-i* *komaginaro i-nti iriro*
 3M-go-EP-PFV-REAL 3M-get-EP-PL-REAL monkey.species 3M-COP 3M.PRO
kishia-t-an-ats-i *anta panko-tsi-ku*
 comb-EP-ABL-SUBJ.FOC-REAL there house-ALIEN-LOC

‘He went and caught monkeys, and [the eagle] kept combing [his feathers] at the house.’

- (A4) *Okantiri maika “kishiatanatsivi maika pinkovintsatakitera pinkovintsatakitera komaginaro anta onkimotanakera pinampina irokona irokona pashi” okantakerira.*
o-kant-i-ri maika kishia-t-an-ats-i-vi maika
 3F-say-REAL-3M now comb-EP-ABL-SUBJ.FOC-REAL-2 now
pi-n-kovintsa-t-aki-t-e-ra
 2-IRR-hunt-EP-ASSOC.MOT:DIST-EP-IRR-SBD
pi-n-kovintsa-t-aki-t-e-ra komaginaro anta
 2-IRR-hunt-EP-ASSOC.MOT:DIST-EP-IRR-SBD monkey.species there
o-n-kimo-t-an-ak-i-ra pi-nanpina iro-kona iro-kona
 3F-IRR-grow-EP-ABL-PFV-IRR-SBD 2-side 3F.PRO-INCR 3F.PRO-INCR
pi-ashi o-kant-ak-i-ri-ra
 2-POSS 3F-say-PFV-REAL-3M-SBD
 ‘Then she said to him, “you keep on combing yourself, today you have to go hunting, you have to go hunt a monkey, so that your partner will grow a little bit” she said to him.’
- (A5) *Ipotevankitanake*
i-pote-vanki-t-an-ak-i
 3M-flap-NI:wing-EP-ABL-PFV-REAL
 ‘He flapped his wings.’
- (A6) *Oneiri yaranake.*
o-ne-i-ri i-ar-an-ak-i
 3F-see-REAL-3M 3M-fly-ABL-PFV-REAL
 ‘She saw him [as] he flew away.’
- (A7) *Yaranake iatake inkenishiku anta inkovintsatera iriro aikiro irityo pakitsa.*
i-ar-an-ak-i i-a-t-ak-i inkenishi-ku anta
 3M-fly-ABL-PFV-REAL 3M-go-EP-PFV-REAL forest-LOC there
i-n-kovintsa-t-e-ra iriro aikiro iri-tyo pakitsa
 3M-IRR-hunt-EP-IRR-SBD he also he-AFFECT harpy.eagle
 ‘He flew away [and] went into the forest in order to hunt, the harpy eagle too.’

- (A8) *Iaigi itomiegi aikiro ikovintsaigi yagaigi yamaigi komaginaro ikanti “neri ina komaginaro kote sekataigakempara.”*
i-a-ig-i i-tomi-egi aikiro i-kovintsa-ig-i i-ag-a-ig-i
 3M-go-PL-REAL 3M-son-PL also 3M-hunt-PL-REAL 3M-get-EP-PL-REAL
i-am-a-ig-i komaginaro i-kant-i neri ina
 3M-bring-EP-PL-REAL monkey.species 3M-say-REAL take.it my.mother
komaginaro n-onko-t-e Ø-n-sekat-a-ig-ak-empa-ra
 monkey.species IRR-cook-EP-IRR 1.INCL-IRR-eat-EP-PL-PFV-IRR-SBD
 ‘His sons also went to hunt, they caught and brought a monkey, they said “take the monkey, mother, cook it so that we can eat.”’
- (A9) *Inti iriro yami yovuokiri en kapashipankoku yoginoriiri yoga yashiriapaaka.*
i-nti iriro i-am-i i-ovuok-i-ri en kapashi
 3M-COP 3M.PRO 3M-carry-REAL 3M-drop-REAL-3M in palm.species
panko-ku i-ogi-nori-i-ri i-oga i-ashiri-apa-ak-a
 house-LOC 3M-CAUS-lie.down-REAL-3M 3M-that 3M-fall-ADL-PFV-REAL
 ‘He brought it, he dropped it on top of the thatched-roof house and laid it down, he made it fall down on top.’
- (A10) *Agiri onkotakeri aikiro iriro iriro aikiro iati ikovintsatira iriro aikiro pakitsa.*
o-ag-i-ri o-onko-t-ak-i-ri aikiro iriro iriro aikiro
 3F-get-REAL-3M 3F-cook-EP-PFV-REAL-3M again 3M.PRO 3M.PRO also
i-a-t-i i-kovintsa-t-i-ra iriro aikiro pakitsa
 3M-go-EP-REAL 3M-hunt-EP-REAL-SBD 3M.PRO also harpy.eagle
 ‘She took it in order to cook it, and the eagle went out to hunt again.’
- (A11) *Onkotakeri impo oka onianiatakeri okisavitakerira itomi.*
o-onko-t-ak-i-ri impo o-oka o-nia-nia-t-ak-i-ri
 3F-cook-EP-PFV-REAL-3M then 3F-this 3F-speak-speak-EP-PFV-REAL-3M
o-kis-a-vi-t-ak-e-ri-ra i-tomi
 3F-make.angry-EP-MOT.OBL-EP-PFV-REAL-3M-SBD 3M-son
 ‘She cooked it later, and she made his son mad by talking to [the eagle].’

- (A12) *“Pinianiatanakeri maika pakitsa inkaontake matsigenka nianianiataerini.”*
pi-nia-nia-t-an-ak-i-ri *maika pakitsa*
2S-speak-speak-EP-ABL-PFV-REAL-3M now harpy.eagle
i-n-kaont-ak-e *matsigenka*
3M-IRR-be.like-PFV-IRR person
n-nia-nia-nia-t-a-e-ri-ni
IRR-speak-speak-speak-EP-DIR:REG-IRR-3M-RECP
‘[He said], “you keep on talking to the eagle as if he were a person that you could talk to.”’
- (A13) *Impogini tataka isuretaka iriro irityo yoga pakitsa?*
impogini tata-ka *i-sure-t-ak-a* *iriro* *iri-tyo*
then what-INDEF 3M.think.EP.PFV.REAL 3M.PRO 3M.PRO-AFFECT
i-oga *pakitsa*
3M-that harpy.eagle
‘What must the eagle have thought?’
- (A14) *Iatake intati anta itinkaraakero oga yovetsikakera imenko ivanko yoga pakitsa.*
i-a-t-ak-i *intati* *anta* *i-tinkara-ak-i-ro* *o-oga*
3M-go-EP-PFV-REAL other.side there 3M-snap-PFV-REAL-3F 3F-that
i-ovetsik-ak-i-ra *i-menko* *i-panko* *i-oga* *pakitsa*
3M-make-PFV-REAL-SBD 3M-nest 3M-house 3M-that harpy.eagle
‘The eagle went across to break off [sticks] to build his nest, his house.’
- (A15) *Itinkaraake itinkaraake terong terong yovetsikake aryomenkorika kara.*
i-tinkara-ak-i *i-tinkara-ak-i* *terong* *terong*
3M-snap-PFV-REAL 3M-snap-PFV-REAL snapping.sound snapping.sound
i-ovetsik-ak-i *aryo-menko-rika* *kara*
3M-make-PFV-REAL truly-NI:nest-INDEF there
‘He snapped off more and more [sticks] ‘terong terong’ and made his big nest there.’

- (A16) *Impogini otarogavagetake iroro oga irotyo iriniro yoga matsigenka.*
impogini o-tarog-a-vage-t-ak-i iroro o-oga iro-tyo
 then 3F-sweep-EP-DUR-EP-PFV-REAL she 3F-that she-AFFECT
iriniro i-oga matsigenka
 his.mother 3M-that person
 ‘Then she was sweeping, she, the mother of the man.’
- (A17) *Impogini otarogavageti, inti oga oshinto anuvageteroka oga oga sotsiku.*
impogini o-tarog-a-vage-t-i i-nti o-oga o-shinto
 then 3F-sweep-EP-DUR-EP-REAL 3M-COP 3F-that 3F-daughter
o-anu-vage-t-ak-i-roka o-oga o-oga sotsi-ku
 3F-walk-DUR-EU-PFV-REAL-EPIS.WK 3F-that 3F-that outside-LOC
 ‘Then she was sweeping, [and] her daughter must have been walking around, um, outside.’
- (A18) *Okemiri maika yarapaake yagapanutiro pe oga oshinto otyomiani.*
o-kem-i-ri maika i-ar-apa-ak-i
 3F-listen-REAL-3M now 3M-fly-ALL-PFV-REAL
i-ag-apanu-t-i-ro pe o-oga o-shinto o-tyomia-ni
 3M-get-DIR:DEP-EP-REAL-3F EMPH 3M-that 3F-daughter 3F-small-ANIM
 ‘She heard him [as] he flew in and he grabbed her young daughter.’
- (A19) *Yagapanutiro opampogiavakeri koa yarakaganake anta yovetsikakera ivanko intati anta.*
i-ag-apanu-t-i-ro o-pampogi-av-ak-i-ri koa
 3M-get-DIR:DEP-EP-REAL-3F 3F-watch-TR-PFV-REAL-3M more
i-ar-akag-an-ak-i anta i-ovetsik-ak-i-ra i-panko
 3M-fly-CAUS-ABL-PFV-REAL there 3M-make-PFV-REAL-SBD 3M-house
intati anta
 other.side there
 ‘He grabbed her, [as] [the mother] watched him, [and] he quickly flew her away to where he had made his house on the other side [of the river].’

2 The poetics of recapitulative linkage in Matsigenka

- (A20) *Okanti “yamanakeroni noshinto.”*
o-kant-i i-am-an-ak-i-ro-ni no-shinto
 3F-say-REAL 3M-bring-ABL-PFV-REAL-3F-RECP 1-daughter
 ‘She said, “he took away my daughter.”’
- (A21) *Ipokapaake itomi ikantiro “virotakani maika kantage-
 kantagetakovagetanatsivi.”*
i-pok-apa-ak-i i-tomi i-kant-i-ro viro-takani maika
 3M-come-ADL-PFV-REAL 3M-SON 3M-say-REAL-3F you-CULP now
kant-a-ge kant-a-ge-t-ako-vage-t-an-ats-i-vi
 do-EP-DSTR do-EP-DSTR-EP-APPL:INDR-DUR-EP-ABL-SUBJ.FOC-REAL-2
 ‘His son came [and] said to her, “it’s your fault, you keep on doing it
 [i.e., talking].”’
- (A22) *“Pine gara yagapanutiro incho”*
pi-ne gara i-ag-apanu-t-i-ro incho
 2-see NEG.IRR 3M-get-DIR:DEP-EP-REAL-3F my.sister
 “Otherwise he wouldn’t have taken my sister away.”
- (A23) *Impo aryompa aryompa anta yogimonkanakero iriro anta intati anta
 ipegakagakero ikovintsavageti komaginaro*
impo aryompa aryompa anta i-ogimonk-an-ak-i-ro iriro anta
 then gradually gradually there 3M-raise-ABL-PFV-REAL-3F 3M.PRO there
intati anta i-peg-akag-ak-i-ro
 other.side there 3M-turn.into-CAUS.SOC-PFV-REAL-3F
i-kovintsa-vage-t-i komaginaro
 3M-hunt-DUR-EP-REAL monkey.species
 ‘But little by little he raised her there on the other side of the river, he
 hunted monkey.’

- (A24) *Aryompa aryompa oneiro iriniro antarotanake ya iroro irishinto antarotanake ya.*
aryompa aryompa o-ne-i-ro iriniro
gradually gradually 3F-see-REAL-3F their.mother
o-antaro-t-an-ak-i ya iroro iri-shinto
3F-be.adult-EP-ABL-PFV-REAL already 3F.PRO 3M-daughter
o-antaro-t-an-ak-i ya
3F-be.adult-EP-ABL-PFV-REAL already
'And bit by bit her mother saw her, she was already grown up.'
- (A25) *Okantiro maika "noshinto aryo oga antarotanake" okantiro "hehe".*
o-kant-i-ro maika no-shinto aryo o-oga
3F-say-REAL-3F now 1-daughter truly 3F-that
o-antaro-t-an-ak-i o-kant-i-ro hehe
3F-be.adult-EP-ABL-PFV-REAL 3F-say-REAL-3F yes
'She said "my daughter, you've grown up", and she said, "yes."'
- (A26) *Aryompa aryompa onamonkitanake.*
aryompa aryompa o-onamonki-t-an-ak-i
gradually gradually 3F-be.pregnant-EP-ABL-PFV-REAL
'Little by little, her belly began to grow.'
- (A27) *Yonamonkitagakero irityo pakitsa oga tsinane.*
i-onamonki-t-ag-ak-i-ro iri-tyo pakitsa
3M-be.pregnant-EP-CAUS.SOC-PFV-REAL-3F 3M.PRO-AFFECT harpy.eagle
o-oga tsinane
3F-that woman
'The eagle had impregnated the woman [lit. made her belly grow].'
- (A28) *Yonamonkitagakero.*
i-onamonki-t-ag-ak-i-ro
3M-be.pregnant-EP-CAUS.SOC-PFV-REAL-3F
'He had impregnated her.'

Abbreviations

1.INCL	first person inclusive	F	feminine
1	first person	HORT	hortative
2	second person	INCR	incremental
3	third person	INDEF	temporally indefinite
ABL	ablative	INF	infinitive
ADJ	adjective	IRR	irrealis
ADL	adlative	LOC	locative
AFFECT	affect	M	masculine
ALIEN	alienable possession	NEG	negation
ALL	allative	NEG.IRR	irrealis negation
ANIM	animate	NI:NEST	incorporated noun: nest
APPL	applicative	NI:WING	incorporated noun: wing
APPL:INDR	indirective applicative	OBJ	object
ASSOC.MOT:DIST	distal associated motion	OBL	oblique
CAUS	causative	PFV	perfective
CAUS.SOC	sociative causative	PL	plural
COP	copula	PN	pronoun
CULP	culpable	PREP	preposition
DEF	definite	PRO	pronoun
DEM	demonstrative	PRS	present
DEP	departative	PST	past
DET	determiner	PTCP	participle
DIR:DEP	directional: departative	REAL	realis
DIR:REG	directional: regressive	RECP	recipient
DSTR	distributive	REFL	reflexive
DUR	durative	SBD	subordinate
EMPH	emphasis	SG	singular
EP	epenthesis	SUBJ.FOC	subject focus
EPIS.WK	weak epistemic modality	TR	transitive
		TRNLOC	translocative

Acknowledgments

Thanks to my Matsigenka friends and colleagues in the Alto Urubamba, Julio Korinti Piñarreal, Valérie Guérin, Simon Overall, and two anonymous reviewers. This research was supported by a Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Re-

search Abroad (DDRA) Fellowship and an NSF Doctoral Dissertation Improvement Grant (1021842). Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation. The research leading to these results also received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007–2013)/ERC grant agreement number 295918. Thanks also to the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University.

References

- Adelaar, Willem F. H. & Pieter Muysken. 2004. *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 1999. The Arawak language family. In R. M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *The Amazonian languages*, 65–106. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2002. *Language contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Babel, Anna M. 2009. Dizque, evidentiality, and stance in Valley Spanish. *Language in Society* 38(4). 487–511.
- Babel, Anna M. 2018. *Between the Andes and the Amazon: Language and social meaning in Bolivia*. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press.
- Baer, Gerhard. 1994. *Cosmología y shamanismo de los Matsigenka*. Quito, Ecuador: Ediciones Abya-Yala.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. 1986. The problem of speech genres. In Mikhail M. Bakhtin, Michael Holquist, Vern McGee & Caryl Emerson (eds.), *Speech genres and other late essays*, 60–102. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, Richard. 1977. *Verbal art as performance*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Beier, Christine, Lev Michael & Joel Sherzer. 2002. Discourse forms and processes in indigenous lowland South America: An areal-typological perspective. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31. 121–145.
- Briggs, Charles L. & Richard Bauman. 1992. Genre, intertextuality, and social power. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 2(2). 131–172.
- Camino, Alejandro. 1977. Trueque, correrías e intercambios entre los Quechuas Andinos y los Piro y Machiguenga de la montaña Peruana. *Amazonía Peruana* 1(2). 123–140.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 2001. *Castellano andino: Aspectos sociolingüísticos, pedagógicos y gramaticales*. Lima: Fondo Editorial PUCP.

2 The poetics of recapitulative linkage in Matsigenka

- Davis, Harold & Betty E. Snell. 1999[1968]. *Kenkitsatagantsi Matsigenka: Cuentos folklóricos de los Machiguenga*. Pucallpa: Ministerio de Educación & Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.
- de Cenitagoya, Vicente. 1944. *Los Machiguengas*. Lima: Sanmarti y Cia.
- de Vries, Lourens. 2005. Towards a typology of tail-head linkage in Papuan languages. *Studies in Language* 29(2). 363–384.
- Emlen, Nicholas Q. 2014. *Language and coffee in a trilingual Matsigenka-Quechua-Spanish frontier community on the Andean-Amazonian borderland of Southern Peru*. Ann Arbor, USA: University of Michigan PhD Dissertation.
- Emlen, Nicholas Q. 2015. Public discourse and community formation in a trilingual Matsigenka-Quechua-Spanish frontier community of Southern Peru. *Language in Society* 44(5). 679–703.
- Emlen, Nicholas Q. 2017. Multilingualism in the Andes and Amazonia: A view from in-between. *Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Anthropology* 22(3). 556–577.
- Emlen, Nicholas Q. 2019. The many Spanishes of an Andean-Amazonian crossroads. In Stephen Fafulas (ed.), *Amazonian Spanish: Language contact and evolution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Escobar, Anna María. 2003. *Contacto social y lingüístico*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Gade, Daniel W. 1972. Comercio y colonización en la zona de contacto entre la sierra y las tierras bajas del Valle del Urubamba en el Perú. *Actas y memorias del XXXIX congreso internacional de Americanistas* 4. 207–221.
- Goffman, Erving. 1974. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper Colophon.
- Guérin, Valérie & Grant Aiton. 2019. Bridging constructions in typological perspective. In Valérie Guérin (ed.), *Bridging constructions*, 1–44. Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI:10.5281/zenodo.2563678
- Guillaume, Antoine. 2011. Subordinate clauses, switch-reference, and tail-head linkage in Cavineña narratives. In Rik van Gijn, Katharina Haude & Pieter Muysken (eds.), *Subordination in native South American languages*, 109–140. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hanks, William F. 1987. Discourse genres in a theory of practice. *American Ethnologist* 14(4). 668–692.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1975. Breakthrough into performance. In Dan Ben-Amos & Kenneth Goldstein (eds.), *Folklore: Performance and communication*, 11–74. New York: Routledge.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1981. *“In vain I tried to tell you”: Essays in Native American ethnopoetics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

- Izquierdo, Carolina & Allen W. Johnson. 2007. Desire, envy and punishment: A Matsigenka emotion schema in illness narratives and folk stories. *Culture, Medicine and Psychiatry* 31. 419–444.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1960. Linguistics and poetics. In Thomas Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language*, 350–359. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Johnson, Allen W. 1999. The political unconscious: Stories and politics in two South American cultures. In Stanley Renshon & John Duckitt (eds.), *Political psychology: Cultural and crosscultural foundations*, 159–181. New York: New York University Press.
- Johnson, Allen W. 2003. *Families of the forest: The Matsigenka Indians of the Peruvian Amazon*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 1998. Arizona Tewa kiva speech as a manifestation of a dominant language ideology. In Bambi B. Schieffelin, Kathryn A. Woolard & Paul V. Kroskrity (eds.), *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*, 103–122. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Michael, Lev. 2008. *Nanti evidential practice: Language, knowledge, and social action in an Amazonian society*. Austin, USA: University of Texas PhD Dissertation.
- Michael, Lev. 2010. *Phonological reconstruction of the Kampan branch of Arawak*. Paper presented at the Workshop on American Indian Languages, 29 April 2010.
- Mihas, Elena. 2015. *A grammar of Alto Perené (Arawak)*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Overall, Simon E. 2014. Clause chaining, switch reference, and nominalizations in Aguaruna (Jivaroan). In Rik van Gijn, Jeremy Hammond, Dejan Matić, Saskia van Putten & Ana Vilacy Galucio (eds.), *Information structure and reference tracking in complex sentences*, 309–340. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Payne, David L. 1981. *The phonology and morphology of Axininca Campa*. Arlington, TX: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Renard-Casevitz, France-Marie. 1981. *Le banquet masqué: Une mythologie de l'étranger chez les indiens Matsigenka*. Paris: Lierre & Coudrier.
- Renard-Casevitz, France-Marie & Cristóbal Pacaia. 1981. *El dios Yabirebi y su cargado Yayenshi/Yaviteri inti yayenshi igiáne*. Edición bilingüe Matsigenka-Español. Biblioteca Andina de Bolsillo, 21. Lima: IFEA/Lluvia Editores.
- Rosengren, Dan. 2000. The delicacy of community: On kisagantsi in Matsigenka narrative discourse. In Joanna Overing & Allan Passes (eds.), *The anthropology of love and anger: The aesthetics of conviviality in Native Amazonia*, 309–340. London: Routledge.

2 The poetics of recapitulative linkage in Matsigenka

- Rosengren, Dan. 2006. Transdimensional relations: On human-spirit interaction in the Amazon. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 12(4). 803–816.
- Schulze, Marlene & Dora Bieri. 1973. Chaining and spotlighting: Two types of paragraph boundaries in Sunwar. In Irvine Davis (ed.), *Clause, sentence, and discourse patterns in selected languages of Nepal*, 389–399. Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu: SIL Oklahoma & Tribhuvan University Press.
- Seifart, Frank. 2010. The Bora connector pronoun and tail-head linkage: A study in language-specific grammaticalization. *Linguistics* 48(2). 893–918.
- Shepard, Glenn H. 2002. Three days for weeping: Dreams, emotions, and death in the Peruvian Amazon. *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 16(2). 200–229.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1976. Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In Keith Basso & Henry A. Selby (eds.), *Meaning in anthropology*, 1–53. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1993. Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In John A. Lucy (ed.), *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 33–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Gijn, Rik. 2014. Repeated dependent clauses in Yurakaré. In Rik van Gijn, Jeremy Hammond, Dejan Matic, Saskia van Putten & Ana Vilacy Galucio (eds.), *Information structure and reference tracking in complex sentences*, 291–308. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vargas Pereira, Haroldo & José Vargas Pereira. 2013. *Matsigenka texts*. http://www.cabeceras.org/ldm_publications/mcb_text_collection_30jun2013_v1.pdf, accessed 2018-9-7.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 1998. Cosmological deixis and Amerindian perspectivism. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 4(3). 469–488.
- Vuillermet, Marine. 2017. *A grammar of Ese Ejja, a Takanan language of the Bolivian Amazon*. Lyon, France: Université Lumière Lyon 2 PhD Dissertation.
- Webster, Anthony K. & Paul V. Kroskrity. 2013. Introducing ethnopoetics: Hymes's legacy. *Journal of Folklore Research* 50(1). 1–11.
- Wojtylak, Katarzyna I. 2017. *A grammar of Murui (Bue): A Witotoan language of Northwest Amazonia*. Cairns, Australia: James Cook University PhD Dissertation.

