

Reprinted from

journal of  
**PRAGMATICS**

---

Journal of Pragmatics 32 (2000) 239–263

Rupturing implicature  
in the Mapudungun verbal system: The suffix *-Fi*<sup>☆</sup>

Lucía A. Golluscio\*

*Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas y Departamento de Letras,  
Universidad de Buenos Aires, 25 de mayo 217, 1° Piso (1002) Buenos Aires, Argentina*

Received 14 April 1997; revised version 15 February 1999



ELSEVIER

# journal of PRAGMATICS

An Interdisciplinary Journal of  
Language Studies

## Chief Editor

Jacob L. Mey, Institute of Language and Communication, Odense University,  
Campusvej 55, DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark (e-mail: jam@dou.dk)

## Editors

Claudia Caffi, Dipartimento di Scienze Glottoetnologiche, Università di Genova, Via Balbi 4, I-16126 Genoa, Italy (e-mail: cambiaghi@pavia.infn.it)  
Hartmut Haberland, Department of Languages and Culture, University of Roskilde, P.O. Box 260, DK-4000 Roskilde, Denmark (e-mail: hartmut@ruc.dk)

Richard W. Janney, Institut für Englische Philologie, Universität München, Schellingstraße 3, D-80799 Munich, Germany (e-mail: janney@anglistik.uni-muenchen.de)

## Assistant Editor

Leo Høye, Institute of Language and Communication, Odense University, DK-5230, Odense M, Denmark (e-mail: leo.hoye@language.ou.dk)

## Special Issues Editor

Rachel Giora, Linguistics Department, Tel-Aviv University, Ramat Aviv, IL-69978 Tel-Aviv, Israel (e-mail: giorar@ccsg.tau.ac.il)

## Squib Editor

Bruce Fraser, School of Education, Boston University, 605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215, USA (e-mail: bfraser@acs.bu.edu)

**Board of Advisory Editors** J. Allwood (Gothenburg), S. Blum-Kulka (Jerusalem), A. Bogusławski (Warsaw), L. Coleman (College Park), B. Comrie (Leipzig), F. Coulmas (Duisburg), M. Dolitsky (Paris), W.U. Dressler (Vienna), C. Fillmore (Berkeley), A. Firth (Aalborg), T. Fretheim (Trondheim), B. Gorayska (Hong Kong), F. Gregersen (Copenhagen), Y. Gu (Beijing), E. Hajičová (Prague), T. Hak (Liverpool), A. Hakulinen (Helsinki), P. Harder (Copenhagen), R.M. Harnish (Tucson), R. Hasan (Sidney), H. Haverkate (Amsterdam), D. Hymes (Charlottesville), S. Ide (Tokyo), A. Kasher (Tel-Aviv), G. Kasper (Honolulu), F. Kiefer (Budapest), R. Lakoff (Berkeley), A. Luke (Brisbane), Yoshiko Matsumoto (Stanford), A. McHoul (Murdoch), J. Nuyts (Antwerp), J.-O. Östman (Helsinki), H. Parret (Brussels), T. Pavlidou (Thessaloniki), U. Quasthoff (Dortmund), M. Sbisà (Trieste), E. Schegloff (Los Angeles), D. Schiffrin (Washington, DC), D. Tannen (Washington, DC), J. Thomas (Bangor), S. Thompson (Santa Barbara), J. van der Auwera (Antwerp), J. Verschueren (Antwerp), J. Wagner (Odense), D. Wilson (London).

Linguistic pragmatics has been able to formulate a number of questions over the years that are essential to our understanding of language as people's main instrument of 'natural' and 'societal' interaction. By providing possible theoretical foundations for the study of linguistic practice, linguistic pragmatics has helped to extend our knowledge of the forms, functions, and foundations, of human interaction. The *Journal of Pragmatics* identifies with the above general scope and aims of pragmatics.

The Journal welcomes authoritative, innovative pragmatic scholarship from all practice oriented linguistic standpoints. It provides a forum for pragmatic studies in sociolinguistics, general linguistics, conversation analysis, discourse analysis, cognitive linguistics, computational linguistics, applied linguistics, and other areas of linguistic research. In addition, it endeavors to narrow the distance between linguistics and such neighboring disciplines as communication science (including the study of face-to-face interaction and nonverbal communication), information science (including artificial intelligence research and, in general, the theory and practice of machine-human interaction), psychiatry (including the study of schizophrenic speech), and neuropsychology (including the study of speaking and reading disorders). The *Journal* welcomes both those contributions originating in linguistics proper, and those taking neighboring, related fields as their point of departure.

All manuscripts for publication should be sent to *Journal of Pragmatics*, Institute of Language and Communication, Odense University, Campusvej 55 DK-5230 Odense M, Denmark. Correspondence about editorial matters should be sent to the Chief Editor. Books for review should be sent to Dr. Rachel Giora, Special Issues Editor, address as above; books sent for review will not be returned. All contributions, including reviews, are expected to comply with the *instructions to authors* printed on the inside back cover of each issue.



Elsevier gratefully acknowledges the support of Odense University.



ELSEVIER

Journal of Pragmatics 32 (2000) 239–263

Journal of  
PRAGMATICS

www.elsevier.nl/locate/pragma

rsity,

Gen-

ty of

chen,

, DK-

v, IL-

wealth

(War-

W.U.

ayska

il), A.

erkate

lulu),

l), A.

lidou

iffirin

ra), J.

essen-

ction.

cs has

*Jour-*

nd lin-

is, con-

uistics,

uistics

terac-

und, in

schiz-

). The

oring,

ge and

idence

Rachel

tribu-

inside

## Rupturing implicature in the Mapudungun verbal system: The suffix *-Fi*<sup>☆</sup>

Lucía A. Golluscio\*

*Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas y Departamento de Letras,  
Universidad de Buenos Aires, 25 de mayo 217, 1° Piso (1002) Buenos Aires, Argentina*

Received 14 April 1997; revised version 15 February 1999

### Abstract

This paper focuses on the analysis of the meaning of the verbal suffix *-Fi* in the frame of the Tense-Aspect-Modality system in Mapudungun. A few recent works have recognized some other features of this marker – traditionally described as a past tense marker – related to modal meaning, counterexpectation, or rupture of current condition of facts. I argue that the

☆ Golluscio (1988) and (1990b) include my preliminary approaches to the suffix *-Fi*. Earlier versions of this paper were presented at a lecture sponsored by the Anthropology and Linguistics Departments and the Center for Cognitive Sciences, University of Texas at Austin (1994), and at the 5th International Pragmatics Conference, Mexico (Golluscio, 1996b).

The data have been collected and tested in Anecón Grande, Chenqueniyeo and Ing. Jacobacci (Río Negro), Ancatruz (Neuquén), and Cushamen (Chubut) from 1974 to 1985. I controlled my conclusions with cases provided by other researchers, especially Robert Croese (1984), Perla Golbert (1975), Adalberto Salas (1984), and Catharina Smeets (1989) as well as with spontaneous texts recorded in 1995 and 1996 in Chenqueniyeo.

I am most grateful to Anthony Woodbury for fruitful exchange about the pragmatic status of the grammatical processes analyzed here. I would also like to thank María Luisa Freyre, Doris Payne, and Thomas Payne for their valuable suggestions on earlier drafts, and Wally Kairuz, for his friendly help with the English version of the paper. I greatly appreciate Vibeke Lynderup's permanent assistance, in spite of distance. Finally, my special thanks are due to Jacob Mey for his generous and solid support, and to the anonymous referees for their thorough reading and criticism. Of course, all mistakes are my own.

My deepest debt is to my principal language consultants: Faqui and Rosa Prafil (Anecón Grande, Río Negro), Raúl Epullán, Lorenza and Guillermo Queupán (Ancatruz, Neuquén) – all of them born before 1920; Lucerinta Cañumil, born in 1925 (Chenqueniyeo, Río Negro); and especially to my teacher of Mapudungun, the late Adolfo Meli, who was born in Cushamen (Chubut), in 1905. All the Mapuche settlements mentioned above are located in the rural areas.

Research has been possible with funds provided by CONICET (National Council for Scientific and Technological Research, Argentina) and by The Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research (U.S.A.), through a postdoctoral Developing Countries Training and Research Fellowship.

\* E-mail: lag@filo.uba.ar

0378-2166/00/\$ – see front matter © 2000 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.

PII: S0378-2166(99)00044-2

verbal suffix *-Fl* is a metapragmatic operator that acts to warn against, block, or rupture conventional implicature in speech.

The present study intends to be a contribution to crosslinguistic research in Pragmatics, since those grammatical categories that express the speaker's alerting to the implicature created in speech seem to be widely spread in American Indian languages, in contrast to Indo-European languages. © 2000 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.

*Keywords:* South American Indian languages; Mapudungun or Araucanian; Verbal system; Conventional implicature; (Meta)pragmatics

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background on Mapudungun

Mapudungun or Araucanian<sup>1</sup> is spoken by the Mapuche (*mapu* 'land'; *che* 'people') of Southern Chile and Argentina. In Chile, the Mapuche population is estimated at 400,000 to nearly one million, according to different sources.<sup>2</sup> They live in a region called 'La Araucanía' or 'La Frontera' ('the border') from the Bío-Bío river (parallel 30) to Lake Llanquihue (parallel 41), and are especially concentrated in the provinces of Cautín and Malleco (Salas, 1984: 11; Smeets, 1989: 3).

In Argentina, the Mapuche live in the Patagonian provinces of Neuquén, Chubut, and Río Negro and, in much smaller number, in the Provinces of La Pampa, Buenos Aires, and Santa Cruz. There is no current and accurate demographic information about the Mapuche who are presently living in our country. The only one Argentine National Indigenous Census (1968) counted 28,621 Mapuche. Reliable unofficial data estimated their number at 37,000 (Gregores, 1974) to 90,000 (Fava, 1991).<sup>3</sup> The absence of official information, either past or present, is not accidental but rather the consequence of the national and local social policies customarily directed at the Indigenous population (Golluscio, 1990a).

Araucanian<sup>4</sup> is the name which the Spaniards gave to the Mapuche, and also to their language. Therefore, it is a name currently rejected not only by the Indigenous

<sup>1</sup> Traditionally considered an Andean-Southern Andean language, Mapudungun has been also grouped either in the macro-Panoan or in the macro-Waikuruan clusters. See Kaufman (1990: 45ff.) for an updated classification.

<sup>2</sup> See Salas (1984, 1992), Smeets (1989), and the 1992 Chilean National Indigenous Census – the latter including population over 14.

<sup>3</sup> Nardi (1981, in Saugy, 1984) counted 50,000 Mapuche including rural as well as urban population. Despite the lack of precise statistics, the Mapuche political organizations emphasize the important volume of Mapuche migration to urban settings.

<sup>4</sup> Araucanian (*araucano*, in Spanish) is derived from Arauco which, according to Adalberto Salas, was "the name that the Spaniards gave to the lower basin of the River Bío Bío. The etymology of *Arauco* is uncertain; it is possibly derived from the Mapuche noun phrase *raiko* 'murky waters' (...). There exist other explanations for the etymology of the word *Arauco* associating it with the Quechua root *awka* 'hostile, rebellious, savage', with which the soldiers and the public officials of the Inca empire qualified the Mapuche because of their bellicosity" (Salas, 1984: 12).

organizations, but also by anthropologists and linguists. *Mapudungu/n* (*mapu* ‘land’; *dungu* ‘language, speech, discourse’/*dungun* ‘to speak’), *Rechedungu/n* (*re* ‘pure’; *che* ‘people’) and *Mapuchedungu/n* (‘the speech of the people of the land’) are the natives’ names for their own language.

Mapudungun is an agglutinative language, characterized by suffixation, reduplication, and noun incorporation. The verb is the core of Mapuche grammar. Verbal morphology is complex, including a number of derivational and inflexional subsystems expressed by “about a hundred suffixes” (Smeets, 1989: 15).<sup>5</sup>

Regarding the sociolinguistic situation in the Argentine Mapuche area, there do not exist reliable diagnoses. In fact, the number of Mapudungun speakers is still an enigma. During this century, and especially in the last five or six decades, there has been an important process of linguistic attrition in the area. The Argentine primary school has been an efficient hispanicizing agent from the very beginning and, nowadays, the contact with the Spanish-speaking regional and national community even in rural and less accessible settlements is frequent and the influence of the media – radio in rural areas, and both radio and television in towns and cities – is increasing.

The current process of language maintenance/shift in the Mapuche area is characterized by heterogeneity. My research in the rural settings (Golluscio, 1988) has shown differences among not only diverse communities, but also different families in the same community, and members of the same family. Thus, people who are competent speakers in Mapudungun and/or superb performers of the Mapuche verbal art may live together with others who use some Mapuche words only as borrowings in their Spanish discourse.<sup>6</sup> And there are communities where Mapudungun is still a living language as well as others where it is almost dead.

However, sometimes the ‘death’ of this language is only apparent. On the one hand, among the bilingual Mapuche people, the individual’s repertoire encompasses a wide and flexible scope from Spanish to Mapudungun. The individual’s choice of one language or the other is made according to the inter- or intra-ethnic characteristics of each concrete communicative event. Actually, it is a question of the speaker’s internal image of the addressee, of himself, and of the situation. On the other hand, ‘dissimulation’, here defined as the hiding of competence and uses in the vernacular language in interethnic contexts, is a historical and current social practice recorded all over the Argentine Mapuche area, not only in urban, but also in rural settlements.<sup>7</sup> This widely spread attitude, serving the resistance strategy marked by the apparent loss of the Mapuche’s own culture vis-à-vis the whites, makes it difficult to determine the actual vitality of Mapudungun (Golluscio, 1990a) and contributes to challenging the use of quantitative parameters to measure the ‘degrees’ of vitality of this aboriginal language.

<sup>5</sup> On Mapuche verbal morphology, see also Golbert (1975), Croese (1984), Fernández Garay (1981, 1998), Golluscio (1983–1985, 1988, 1996a–b and 1998), Grimes (1985), Harmelink (1988), Salas (1978, 1992).

<sup>6</sup> ‘Age’, ‘migration’ and ‘socialization’ (main agent/s and setting) decisively mark the individual’s degree of competence in Mapudungun.

<sup>7</sup> About this extended and antique Native American resistance strategy, see Arguedas (1968) and Paulson (1990).

In synthesis, as every historical and social practice, language is a dynamic process, and the prediction of language death for Mapudungun is still too rash. Furthermore, as Joshua Fishman affirms, “roots are alive” (Fishman, 1981). Relevant experiences towards linguistic and cultural revival are currently taking place in Chile and in Argentina. Moreover, the recovery of traditional links between the Mapuche living on both sides of the Andes appears as one of the main goals of the most radical Mapuche young political leaders.

### 1.2. Aim and framework of the study

In this paper, I am particularly concerned with the meaning of the Mapudungun verbal suffix *-Fɪ* as it emerges from speech. I introduce the subject by discussing the limitations of the traditional definition of *-Fɪ* as a temporal morpheme. The core of the article focuses on the analysis of the uses of this suffix in its two main contexts of occurrence: (1) non-future-tensed utterances and (2) future-tensed utterances. Afterwards, I explore the role of *-Fɪ* in the rhetorical structure of discourse, especially in narrative, as well as its relationship with the Tense-Aspect-Modality system in Mapudungun. Conclusions are oriented towards the definition of *-Fɪ* as a non-referential, but indexical marker grammaticalized in that language.

The analysis of this grammatical category, which plays a relevant role in the structuring of the Mapuche verbal system and in the rhetorical structure of Mapuche discourse, is a topic of interest for several reasons.

First, regarding the study of Mapudungun, scholars have historically found great difficulties in defining this slippery category in terms of any Western grammatical frame, either a traditional Latin-oriented frame or a modern referential one.

Secondly, and in the wider frame of the study of the languages of the Americas, *-Fɪ* belongs to a “very widespread category in the American Indian Languages which has not been attended to enough and which is not present in Indoeuropean languages” (Anthony Woodbury, personal communication).<sup>8</sup>

Finally, the analysis of the uses of this metapragmatic grammatical operator<sup>9</sup> as it acts in this little-known American indigenous language is a contribution to linguistic theory and to the theory of meaning.

Starting from a discourse-centered approach to language and culture, I follow an interactional perspective on the study of the linguistic phenomena which takes into account the speaker’s choice as well as the cognitive processes triggered not only in him/her, but also in the addressee. On this regard, the treatment of *-Fɪ* is impossible without considering the world of cultural presuppositions shared by the members of the Mapuche speech community. Processes of inference and counterinference allow the Mapuche hearer to derive the contextual meanings of *-Fɪ* in the framework of his/her knowledge of the language, the speaker and him/herself, and the common world.

<sup>8</sup> In this sense, Anthony Woodbury called my attention to the Yupik suffix *-yaaqe* and the ‘in vain’ Clackamas Chinook category, which is well known from the title of Dell Hymes’ book (Hymes, 1981).

<sup>9</sup> “Signs functioning metapragmatically have pragmatic phenomena – indexical sign phenomena – as their semiotic objects; they, then, have an inherently ‘framing’, or ‘regimenting’, or ‘stipulative’ character with respect to indexical phenomena” (Silverstein, 1993: 33).

## 2. Preliminaries

### 2.1. Is *-F1* a temporal morpheme?

The following is an excerpt of Mapuche natural discourse:<sup>10</sup>

- (1) a. *kiñe kiyen dewma mawin- (e) i*  
 one month already rain- IND (3)  
 'It rained a month ago.'
- b. *kiñe kiyen dewma mawin- F1 - i*  
 one month already rain- IND (3)<sup>11</sup>  
 'It rained a month ago [but to no avail].'

<sup>10</sup> I am using, in general, the 'Mapuche Unified Alphabet', developed in Chile by Croese et al. (1978), and adopted by the Linguistic Society of Chile (1988), for transcription. I use the symbols /i/ and /i/, instead of the 'Unified System' symbols /ü/ and /q/, for the unrounded back vowel and the unrounded semivowel respectively.

The following are the orthographic symbols used in the representation of Mapudungun, with the correspondent phonetic value specified.

#### Vowels

- i* high front unrounded  
*e* mid front unrounded  
*a* low central unrounded  
*o* mid back rounded  
*u* high back rounded<sup>1</sup>  
*i* high back unrounded (in stressed positions); mid central unrounded (in unstressed positions)

#### Consonants

- p* voiceless bilabial stop  
*t* voiceless dental or interdental stop  
*t* voiceless alveolar stop  
*k* voiceless velar stop  
*tr* alveopalatal retroflex affricate  
*ch* palatal affricate  
*f* voiceless labiodental fricative (in this variety)  
*d* voiceless interdental fricative (in this variety)  
*s* voiceless alveolar fricative  
*sh* voiceless palatal fricative  
*r* voiced alveopalatal retroflex  
*m* voiced bilabial nasal  
*n* voiced dental or interdental nasal  
*n* voiced alveolar nasal  
*ñ* voiced palatal nasal  
*ng* voiced velar nasal  
*l* voiced dental or interdental lateral  
*l* voiced alveolar lateral  
*ll* voiced palatal lateral  
*w* back rounded semivowel (sometimes bilabialized)  
*y* front unrounded semivowel (with spirantization)  
*i* back unrounded semivowel (sometimes with spirantization)

<sup>11</sup> The abbreviations used in this work are the following: AFFECT 'affected'; AP1 and AP2 'anaphoric pronouns 1 and 2' (Smeets, 1989); CAUS 'causative'; COND 'conditional'; CONF 'confir-

Then, the consultant added, orienting her explanation specially to me, the only non-Mapuche member of her audience:

- (1) c. *mina kime mawin nga kari - tu - lle - la - i kachu*  
 very good rain DISC green-VERB-CONF-NEG-IND (3) grass  
 ‘Certainly, the grass did not become green with the very good rain.’

As it emerges from this example, the referential content of both (1a) and (1b) is the same: It did rain a month ago. However, the presence of *-Fi* after the verbal stem in (1b) indicates the Mapuche addressee that the anticipated results were not forthcoming. In other words, some implicature of ‘results in environment’ is created by the verb ‘to rain’ used by the speaker; that pragmatic inference is what is broken by *-Fi*, as it is later made explicit by the speaker (1c).

In the traditional studies on this language, and some of the most important modern works,<sup>12</sup> *-Fi* has been generally considered a marker of Past Tense. The arguments discussed below challenge this interpretation of *-Fi*.

---

mative’; CONT ‘continuative/habitual’; DISC ‘discourse marker’; DU ‘dual’; DI\* ‘direct marker’ (Grimes, 1985); DIR ‘directional’; DUB ‘dubitative marker’; DUR ‘durative’; EVID ‘evidential 1 (immediacy to speaker/certainty)’; FACT ‘factitive’; FUT ‘future’; IMP ‘imperative’; IND ‘indicative’; INT ‘interrogative marker’; INTERJ ‘interjection’; INV\* ‘inverse marker’; NEG ‘negative’; NOM ‘nominalizer’; NON-F ‘non-finite verbal form’; NON-FUT ‘non-future’; NON-PART\* ‘non-participant’ (Grimes, 1985); PART\* ‘participant=non-minimal’; PART=MIN\* ‘participant=minimal’; PL ‘plural’; POS ‘possessive’; PPOS ‘postposition’; PROG ‘progressive’; PRO ‘personal pronoun’; RE ‘iterative/restoring’; REC ‘reciprocal’; REP ‘evidential 2 (reportative/inferential)’; RUPT ‘marker of rupture of implicature’; SG ‘singular’; STAT ‘stative’; TRANS ‘transitivizer’; VERB ‘verbalizer’; VS ‘verbal stem’; VSUF ‘verbal suffix’; 1\* ‘first person’; 2\* ‘second person’; (3) ‘third person, unmarked’.

The suffix *-Fi* is not categorized on the second line of the examples, since its meaning is the topic under consideration in the present paper.

The abbreviations with an asterisk (\*) all refer to referential markers. The Mapuche referential system “reflects a person-oriented hierarchy of participants” (Grimes, 1985: 141; Salas, 1978). This topicality scale in combination with a direction-marking system (Hockett, 1966; see also research on ‘inverse systems’ in Payne, 1993; Givón, 1994; Dámaso Vieyra, 1994; Arnold, 1997) dominates the ranking of thematic roles, and is almost independent of the grammatical relations. Following Grimes (1985), I use PART ‘participant’ for the referents interacting in the speech event: the speaker (first person, always the highest in the ranking of topicality) and the addressee (second person). They are categorized as PART=MIN ‘participant=minimal’ when there are only two individuals involved. The third person is categorized as NON-PART ‘non-participant’. Since Mapudungun is characterized by its marking the direction of the action, the abbreviation INV ‘inverse’ is used when the thematicity is inverted from the direct flow of attention. For example, a NON-PART, which can never be the topic by definition, is categorized as INV ‘inverse’ when it is acting on a topically more important primary referent, that is, a first person (‘he called me’) or a second person (‘he called you’).

<sup>12</sup> The following studies considered *-Fi* as a morpheme of Past Tense: Valdivia (1603: 13), Havestadt (1777: 19), also Augusta (1903: 25–27), Lenz (1944: 439), Golbert (1975), and Salas (1984).

Among contemporary works, the first steps towards a redefinition of the status of *-Fi* have been taken by Salas (1970: 80), who anticipates the notion of ‘rupture’ developed in this work by defining the use of *-Fi* in relation to ‘inefficient or unuseful actions in the past’. Fernández Garay (1981: 13) proposes a modal value for *-Fi*, more than a temporal one; in a recent study, she defines *-Fi* as an ‘evidential modality’ which indicates the hearer that the fact is not true (Fernández Garay, 1998).



a. The Araucanian temporal system is a binary system defined by a basic opposition marked by the suffix *-a* 'FUT' versus *-0* 'non-fut', with the unmarked form used for both past and present events,<sup>13</sup> as the following examples show:

- (2) a. *fewla mīle - i ko*  
now be - IND (3) water  
'Now, there is water.'  
b. *kwīfi mīle - i awkan*  
in ancient be - IND (3) war times  
'A long time ago there was a war.'  
c. *ka tripanu mīle - a - i awkan*  
other year be - fut - ind (3) war  
'Next year there will be a war.'

b. In addition, there have been recorded unquestionable occurrences of *-F1* in linguistic or experiential contexts in the Present.

- (3) *nie - F1 - n kiñe peñi* (Croese, 1984: example 9)  
have - IND.1SG one brother  
'I have one brother [but he isn't here/or I don't know him].'  
(4) *petu ngan - F1 - n dengill* (Croese, 1984: example 11)  
still sow - IND.1SG bean  
'I am still sowing beans [but it's time for lunch].'  
(5) *ney am ta ti kim - lawen - F1 - i chi*  
who INT AP1 AP2 know - medicine - IND (3) DUB  
'Who knows something about medicine? [nobody.]'

Moreover, the same verbal form has been recorded in present and past contexts:

- (6) a. *kutran - kīle - F1 - n* (Croese, 1984: example 13)  
pain - STAT - IND.1S  
'I am ill [but I can work a little].'  
b. *kamel kutran- kīle- F1 - n meke - n ñi kidawī-n*  
other time pain - STAT - IND.1S go on - IND.1SG POS.1S work - NOM  
'Last year I was sick. [However], I went on working.'

Following independent lines of research, my position on this topic (since Golluscio, 1983–85, 1988, 1990) is more closely in keeping with Robert Croese's characterization of *-F1* (*-fu* in the dialect he studied) in relation to the 'notion of counterexpectation' (Croese, 1984: 4) as well as with Smeets' definition of *-F1* as an 'Impeditive' marker which "indicates the unsuccessful realization of an event" (see Smeets, 1989: 300ff., for a detailed treatment of this verbal suffix). However, neither of them analyzes the (meta)pragmatic nature of this suffix.

<sup>13</sup> See Croese (1984: 66f.) and Puschmann (1984: 55f.) for the Mapudungun spoken in Chile, and Golluscio (1983–85, 1988: 277f.) for the variety/ies spoken in Argentina.

c. Furthermore, *-Fi* cannot be considered a Past marker since it may co-occur with the ‘FUTURE’ suffix *-a*.<sup>14</sup>

- (7) a. *elu - fi - (i) - (i)ñ ko wiyalfewla*  
 give - NON-PART/DI<sup>16</sup>- IND - 1PL water yesterday/now  
 ‘I gave/give him water yesterday/now.’
- (7) b. *elu - a - fi - (i) - (i)ñ ko*  
 give - FUT - NON-PART/DI - IND - 1PL water  
 ‘I will give him water.’
- (7) c. *elu - a - Fi - (i) - iñ ko*  
 give - FUT - IND - 1PL water  
 ‘I would give (him) water [if I had it].’

If *Fi* is not a past marker, then what is it?

- (8) a. *amu - n ta ñi ruka mew kon - pa - n*  
 go - IND.1SG AP1 POS1G house PPOS enter - DIR - IND.1SG  
 ‘I went (came) to my house; I entered.’
- b. *amu - Fi - n kon - pu - la - n*  
 go - IND.1SG enter - DIR - NEG - IND.1SG  
 ‘I went [to enter]; I didn’t enter.’
- (9) a. *mawtu - i ta ti pichi wentru*  
 sleep - IND (3) AP1 AP2 little boy  
 ‘The little boy slept.’
- b. *mawtu - Fi - i ta ti pichi wentru*  
 sleep- IND (3) AP1 AP2 little boy  
 ‘The little boy [wanted] to sleep [but he could’t].’
- (10) a. *mawim - ka - Fi - i nga*  
 rain - CONT - IND (3) DISC  
 ‘It rained [but to no avail].’
- (10) b. *anki - tu - i mapu*  
 dry - VERB - IND (3) land  
 ‘The land is dry.’

After the observation and comparison of a significant number of utterances such as the examples given above,<sup>16</sup> in which verbal stems occur with or without *-Fi*, I formulate the following general assumption and working hypothesis.

<sup>14</sup> The co-occurrence of *-a-Fi* has been generally interpreted as a morphological unit meaning ‘conditioned future’ (Salas, 1974, 1984, 1992), Golbert (1975). Fernández Garay (1981) recognized the two morphemes, but then she analyzed them as a unit. Croese (1984), Golluscio (1983–85, 1988), Smeets (1989), and Fernández Garay (1998) recognize them as two different morphemes.

<sup>15</sup> Regarding this category, as well as the others that refer to the complex referential system in Mapudungu, see fn. 11, and Grimes’ important work on this topic (1985: 141–163) which, in his own words, “builds on Salas’s work” (Salas, 1978). The closing suffix *-iñ* ‘1 PL’ involves both the Agent and the Patient.

<sup>16</sup> The corpus includes 205 utterances [+*-Fi*], with a significant number of pairs [+/-*-Fi*], recorded by elicitation as well as in natural discourse.

## 2.2. Assumption

I assume, for all the utterances with Verbal Stem (VS) + *-Fl* taken into account, the existence of:

- a. Two members [*p*, which bears VS + *-Fl*, and *q*, implicated by *p*] in a close pragmatic association of the type: ‘if/given *p*, *q* may be expected’; and
- b. A third member *z* [some type of consequent, counter-implicated by the occurrence of *-Fl*] which may – or may not – be made explicit in the context of the utterance.

## 2.3. Hypothesis

- a. Whenever *-Fl* appears, there is a warning against, an interruption, or a rupture of the pragmatic relationship created between *p* and *q*.<sup>17</sup>
- b. This pragmatic relationship is some type of conventional implicature introduced by the verb in *p*.<sup>18</sup>
- c. The verbal suffix *-Fl* acts as a marker of the speaker’s subjective evaluation.

## 3. Discussion

I have selected two sets of utterances, according to a basic opposition: the presence or not of the Mapuche suffix *-a* ‘FUTURE’ in the verbal forms:

- Group I: Non-future-tensed utterances [Verbal Stem minus *-a* ‘FUT’+ *-Fl*]
- Group II: Future-tensed utterances [Verbal Stem plus *-a* ‘FUT’+ *-Fl*]<sup>19</sup>

For each set of cases, I intend to define their pragmatic chain/s of association, and to prove the obligatory existence of:

- a. An ‘alerting’ or ‘blocking circumstance’ (Longacre, 1985) which alters, interrupts, or definitively brings the property that defines that pragmatic relationship to an end;
- b. the identification of *-Fl* as the morphological marker of that circumstance (with or without an extension in the syntactic context); and
- c. the consequence of that warning or rupture (linguistically expressed or not).

<sup>17</sup> I assume, for all the cases considered in this work, that the pragmatic relationships at play characterize not only the verbal form, but also the whole utterance. In addition, more than one pragmatic relationship may intersect in the same utterance.

<sup>18</sup> I follow the Gricean seminal distinction between conventional and conversational implicatures (Grice, 1975). About this concept, see also Karttunen and Peters (1977), among others.

<sup>19</sup> The present analysis is restricted to some primary contexts of the occurrence of *-Fl* (plus or minus *-a* ‘FUT’). For more complex co-occurrences, like those with the suffix *-pe* ‘EVID’, *+/- -la* ‘NEG’, *+/- -a* ‘FUT’, in different combinations, see Golluscio (1996a). However, the conclusions presented in this opportunity with respect to the meaning of *-Fl* are valid also for those other cases.



(ii) Situations which almost happen (in these cases, the presence of -F1 indicates that not even the intentions, considered intrinsic to the agent, are realized).

- (14) a. *la - (ng)im - ñma - e - i - yu* *ta mi trewa*  
 die- CAUS- AFFECT- PART=MIN- IND- 2DU AP1 POS2SG dog  
 'I killed your dog (to hurt you).'
- b. *epe la - (ng)im - ñma - F1 - e - i - yu ta*  
 almost die- CAUS- AFFECT- - PART=MIN- IND- DU2 AP1  
*mi trewa*  
 POS2SG dog  
 'I almost killed your dog (to hurt you).'

Then, since in Subgroup (i) situations *do happen*, and in subgroup (ii) situations *do not happen*, another question arises: How does the Mapuche hearer interpret what is implicated in each case, that is, the meaning of the warning introduced by -F1? In other words, how does the addressee know that the event/or state which is interrupted or frustrated does happen (in one case) or it does not happen in another?

In examples such as (14a), it would be possible to assert that there are contextual 'cues' (as *epe* 'almost') which indicate that the event stated by the verb was not accomplished. However, the occurrence of those type of 'cues' is not obligatory. If a Mapuche speaker says:

- (14) c. *la - (ng)im - ñma - F1 - e - i - yu ta mi trewa*  
 die- CAUS- AFFECT- - PART=MIN- IND- DU2 AP1 POS2SG dog  
 'I [almost ] killed your dog (to hurt you).'

his/her addressee interprets *epe* 'almost', without the speaker's necessity of being explicit.

In order to define the scope of each group of situations referred to by Subgroup I.A, I quantitatively tested the incidence of the following parameters over a corpus of 59 examples:

- Situation type: + event vs. – event
- Perspective: + punctual vs. – punctual
- Consequent: + explicit vs. – explicit

Conclusions are schematized in Table 1 below.

Table 1

Purpose-implicating situations which <i>do</i> happen tend to be:	Purpose-implicating situations which <i>almost</i> happen tend to be:
+ events or + states	+ events
– punctual	+ punctual
+ explicit consequent	– explicit consequent

Finally, within this group of ‘purpose-implicating situations’, *p* and *q*, the two members of the relationship are frequently presented in a *parallelistic and antithetic structure*, as it is shown in the following example (15), and schematized in Table 2:

- (15) a. *elu- fì -iñ ko pi- la- i*  
 give 1PL(A+P) water want- NEG- IND (3)  
 ‘I [couldn’t] give him water; he didn’t want.’
- (15) b. *elu- f(i)- iñ ko*  
 give- NON- PART- 1PL water  
 ‘I gave him water.’

Table 2

Clause 1 ( <i>p</i> )	Clause 2 ( <i>z</i> )
Verbal Stem plus <i>-Fì</i>	Verbal Stem plus <i>-la</i> ‘NEG’, or verb in semantic contrast
Verbal Stem minus <i>-Fì</i>	+/- Verbal Stem minus <i>-la</i> ‘NEG’

### 3.1.2. Remarks on Subgroup I.A

First, ‘purpose’ is a label which encompasses wish and end pursued (intention) or end attained (results). In Group I.A, a close and necessary association (Grimes, 1975: 276ff.) between both of them is established, so that: in (i), the verb expresses an event (or state) which does happen, but whose result is not accomplished; while in (ii), the presence of *-Fì* implicates not only the non-realized result of the event, but especially the frustration of the source’s intention, since the event does not happen.

Second, the suffix *-Fì* is always added to the verbal stem which bears the ‘source’s purpose’s’ conventional implicature in *p*, not to *q*’s verbal stem which may detach the implicature nor to *z*’s verbal stem which manifests the consequence.

Third, in the cases in which a conventional implicature of purpose is created, the occurrence of both members of the pragmatic relationship (the antecedent *p* and the consequent *z*) linked in a parallelistic and antithetic structure has been recorded with a high frequency.

Fourth, the second member *q*, which detaches the implicature, is not obligatory, since it is inferred from the consequent *z*.

Finally, the pragmatic relationship between *p* and *q* proposed by the general Assumption above, becomes disrupted by the occurrence of *-Fì* plus/ or minus an explicit consequent *z*.

### 3.1.3. I.B. Minus (–) purpose-implicating utterances

Regarding Group I.B, I take into account 95 cases with *-Fì* (see fn. 16) in order to define which pragmatic relationships are involved in this group and, in consequence, which conventional implicatures are affected by the presence of *-Fì*. The cases are grouped according to the following formal characteristics of the verbs in the whole context of utterance:

- Verbal Stem + *-ke* 'DUR'<sup>23</sup>  
 Verbal Stem + *-pe* 'EVID'  
 Verbal Stem + *-me* 'DIR' + *-ke* 'DUR' = 'PROG' (or syntactic construction *piti* 'still' + Verb)  
 Verbal Stem

Simple, compound and complex utterances are taken into account.

3.1.3.1. I.B.1. Continuation-up-to-the-present-implicating utterances

a. Verbal Stem + *-ke* 'DURATIVE'

Among this set of examples, two subsets of verbs may be recognized:

(i) Verbs + Habituality

- (16) a. *fill anti ngillatu-ke-i-ngin*  
 every day pray- DUR- IND- 3PL  
 'They prayed every day.'  
 b. *kwifi ngillatu-ke-Fl-i-ngin*  
 in ancient days pray- DUR- - IND- 3PL  
 'A long time ago, they used to pray.'
- (17) a. *fill anti tayil-ke-i-ngin*  
 every day tayil- DUR- IND -3PL  
 'Every day, they do *tayil* (sacred songs).'
- b. *kwifi tayil-ke-Fl-i-ngin*  
 in ancient times tayil- DUR- - IND- 3PL  
 'A long time ago, they used to do *tayil* (sacred songs) [they do not do it anymore].'

(ii) Verbs – Habituality

- (18) a. *pofu-nge-i*  
 crazy- VERB- IND (3)  
 'He is/was crazy.'
- b. *pofu-nge-ke-Fl-i*  
 crazy- VERB- DUR- - IND (3)  
 'He was crazy [now he isn't crazy any more].'

The analysis of the examples collected in the field shows the following:

<sup>23</sup> 'CONSTANT', in Smeets' terminology (Smeets, 1989).

<sup>24</sup> As a product of a specific process of grammaticalization in Mapudugun, the suffix *-pe* derives historically from the verb *pen* 'to see'. For a detailed analysis of this Mapuche verbal suffix, see Golluscio (1996a).

Table 3

Verbal Stems + <i>-ke</i> '+ HABITUALITY' tend to be:	Verbal Stems + <i>-ke</i> '-HABITUALITY' tend to be:
+ events ( <i>miley</i> 'to be', with locative meaning, included).	– events (especially verbs of possession, existence, perception, and cognition).

b. Verbal Stem + *-pe* 'IMMEDIACY; VALIDITY'

- (19) a. *chayi ta mile-pe-n ta waria mew*  
today AP1 be- EVID- IND.1SG AP1 town PPOS  
'Today I was in the town.'
- b. *chayi ta mile-pe-Fi-n ta waria mew*  
today AP1 be- EVID- - IND.1SG AP2 town PPOS  
'Today I was in the town [but I left].'

The suffix *-pe* is an evidential marker originally associated with direct perception<sup>25</sup> which diachronically developed a deictic value of 'immediacy/proximity to speaker'. In line with this indexical meaning, the occurrence of *-pe* also signals the speaker's commitment to the factuality of the situation referred to by the verb marked by *-pe*. In other words, the occurrence of *-pe* creates both a pragmatic relationship of 'proximity' between the situation referred to by the verb and the moment of speech and, at the same time, a pragmatic inference of 'validity' of the facts spoken about. Therefore, a double conventional implicature becomes ruptured by *-Fi*, both the 'continuation-up-to-the-present' implicature and the implicature related to the 'high degree of epistemic probability' assigned by the speaker to the fact.

c. Verbal Stems + *-me* 'DIR' + *-ke* 'DUR' = 'PROGRESSIVE' (or *piti* 'still' + verb, in a syntactic construction)

- (20) a. *kichatu-me-ke-n*  
wash- DIR+DUR= PROGR- IND.1SG  
'I went on washing.'
- b. *kichatu-me-ke-Fi-n*  
wash- DIR+DUR= PROGR- IND.1SG  
'I was washing [and I stopped].'
- (21) a. *fewla nga piti ngitramka-i-ngin*  
now DISC still chat- IND- 3PL  
'They are chatting now.'
- b. *fewla nga piti ngitramka-Fi-i-ngin*  
now DISC still chat- - IND- 3PL  
'They were just chatting[and they have stopped].'

<sup>25</sup> See fn. 21.



Progressivity, as it is shown in the examples above, manifests itself in Mapudungun by means of morphological and syntactic devices. The occurrence of *-FI* breaks or interrupts the conventional implicature of *continuity up-to-the-present* created by progressive verbal constructions.

### 3.1.3.2. I.B.2. Sequentiality-implicating utterances

a. Sequentiality in the realm of thought [Verbs ‘governing intention’ + *-fi*]

- (22) a. *ayi- fi - n ta ti wentru kure- ye-*  
 want- NON-PART- IND.1SG AP1 AP2 man wife- VERB-  
*(y)a- l*  
 FUT- NON-F  
 ‘I wanted that man to take me as his wife [and I succeeded].’
- b. *ayi- FI- n ta ti wentru kure- ye- (y)a- l*  
 want- - IND.1SG AP1 AP2 man wife- VERB- FUT- nonF  
 ‘I wanted that man to take me as his wife [but I didn’t succeed].’
- (23) a. *wiya kipa- mate- tu- n inche*  
 yesterday want- *mate\**- VERB- IND.1SG PRO 1SG  
 \*a South American traditional drink  
 ‘Yesterday, I wanted to drink *mate* [and I did].’
- b. *wiya kipa- mate- tu- FI - n*  
 yesterday want- *mate*- VERB- - IND.1SG  
 ‘Yesterday, I wanted to drink *mate* [but I couldn’t].’

‘Verbs governing intention’ are states, that is, stable situations characterized by duration which lack shifts or variation and require an external agency for changing into or out of the state (Smith, 1991: 28, 37ff.) In the case of this set of verbs, a *chain of expectation between the source (usually, the speaker) and his/her target*<sup>25</sup> is created. This is the conventional implicature which appears broken by *-FI*.

In addition, the specific semantic content of the verbs of this group associates it also to the last statement in my working hypothesis, such as it was formulated in the Preliminaries. Indeed, in all the cases of this group, it is the speaker’s internal expectations that are not fulfilled, and his/her feeling of frustration becomes overtly manifested by *-FI*.

b. Sequentiality in time: Consecutive situations [Verbal Stem + *-pe* + *-FI*]

- (24) *ñi patron kipa- nge pi- e- n- ew*  
 POS1SG boss come -IMP.2SG tell - NON-PART/INV1- IND.1SG-  
 NON-PART/INV2  
*mile- pe- FI - n xacobasi m(e)w*  
 be- EVID- - IND.1SG Ing. Jacobacci PPOS  
 ‘My boss told me to come back; I was staying in Ing. Jacobacci [but I left].’

In the cases of compound utterances where the included clauses are linked in a temporal sequence, the occurrence of *-FI* in the verb which expresses the former situation, causes that situation to reach completion. Therefore, it locates the situation

alluded to by the verb which bears *-Fi*, in a temporal frame which becomes disconnected with the verb of the other situation. So, in all the cases of this set, there are two past events: the former had been fully completed before the onset of the other, which may – or may not – be linguistically expressed. The pragmatic relationship which becomes disputed in discourse, then, is one of *temporal contiguity* between the situation stated by the Verbal Stem [+ *-Fi*] and the subsequent situation.<sup>26</sup>

#### 3.1.4. Remarks on Subgroup I.B

First, the requirements proposed above at the beginning of the Discussion for the totality of GROUP I have been tested.

Second, whereas in the case of Verbs belonging to Group I.A, the pragmatic relationships which are disrupted or frustrated by the occurrence of *-Fi* are typical *pragmatic implications*, the cases taken into account within Group I.B manifest pragmatic relationships of sequentiality or *continuation-up-to-the-present* (created by some structural characteristics of the verb in the context of utterance) which appear affected by *-Fi*.

#### Group II: Future-tensed utterances [Verbal Stem + -a 'FUT' + -Fi]

In this section, I will analyze the meaning of the co-occurrence of *-a 'FUT' + -Fi* in simple utterances – see examples (25), (26), and (27). Regarding complex utterances in Mapudungun, I will only furnish some preliminary analyses for concessives (28) and conditionals (29).

- (25) a. *pewmangen ka pe-w-a-i-yu*  
 INTERJ again see- REC- FUT- IND- 2DU  
 'I wish we could see each other again.'
- b. *pewmangen fey ka pe-w-a-Fi-i-yu*  
 INTERJ then again see- REC- FUT- IND- 2DU  
 'I wished we could have seen/had seen each other again.'
- (26) a. *amu-lu ta inche ti trawin mew*  
 go- NON-F AP1 PRO1SG AP1 meeting PPOS  
 'I went to the meeting.'
- b. *amu-a-Fi-lu ta inche ti trawin mew*  
 go- FUT- - NON-F AP1 PRO1SG AP2 meeting PPOS  
 'I would have gone to the meeting [but I didn't].'
- (27) *chum-a-Fi-i-ngin*  
 what (to do)- FUT- - IND- 3PL  
 'What could they do? [They couldn't do anything.]'
- (28) *mawin-lle-Fi-l-e inche amu-tu-a-Fi-n*  
 rain- CONF- COND- 3SG PRO1SG go- RE- FUT- IND. 1SG  
 'Even if it had rained, I would have gone back.'

<sup>26</sup> About this rupture of the temporal contiguity, see Andrés Bello's early and accurate remarks about what he called 'Ante-Copretérito' (Past Perfect), challenging the terminology used by Latin grammars as well as by the Spanish Language Royal Academy (Bello, 1857).



this particular GROUP. While the verbal forms [+ -a] manifest the high degree of probability ('chance', in García's terms)<sup>27</sup> given by the speaker to the events referred to by the utterances (the speaker is sure or almost sure that they will occur), the occurrence of *-Fi* following *-a* potential or actually annuls that probability. In that case, a warning against – or break of – *hypotheticality* is produced, as can be seen from all the examples. This phenomenon occurs not only in concessive and conditional complex periods, but also in desiderative or dubitative utterances (which could be assumed as deeply depending on a performative verb of wish or doubt), as well as in rhetorical questions or polite requests.

This is also the way in which the meaning of 'conditioned future', traditionally attributed to the co-occurrence of *-a* + *-Fi*, emerges (Augusta, 1903; Golbert, 1975; Salas, 1978, 1984, 1992??). The occurrence of *-Fi* might be interpreted by the addressee either as a 'conditioned future', a 'future in the past', or a 'totally cancelled future', according to the context of the whole utterance. The expression of counterfactuality is located at one end of this continuum which ranges, then, from 'uncertainty' to 'knowledge to the contrary', see (29).

### 3.2.1. Remarks on Group II

First, the utterances of Group II encompass improbable (non-real connected to the future; non-factual) and impossible (non-real, connected to the past; counterfactual) situations.

Second, hypotheticality appears to be the conventional implicature introduced by the Mapuche 'FUTURE' marker *-a*; this is broken by the occurrence of *-Fi* after *-a*.

Third, the treatment of Group II also contributes to testing the part of the hypothesis related to the speaker's commitment to his/her assertions. In this sense, the introduction of *-Fi* installs the utterance in domains associated to low degrees of confidence of the speaker with regard to the realization of the event referred to by the verb in the context of the utterance.

Overall, the analysis of Group II confirms the three statements of my working hypothesis, since the occurrence of *-Fi* not only produces the rupture of a particular pragmatic relationship, but also makes explicit the speaker's subjective evaluation. Thus, the presence of this particular verbal suffix contributes to the *modality* of the sentence, in intersection with the other pragmatic relationships (Longacre, 1983; Palmer, 1986; Bybee et al., 1994; Mithun, 1995).

The relation of *-Fi* both to the *epistemic* and to some types of *agent-oriented modalities* is analyzed in the following section.

## 4. Fi and modality

### 4.1. Epistemic modality (M1)

A particular degree of *epistemic probability* (M1) is present in the totality of cases considered in this work (both Groups I and II), ranging from 'improbable' to 'impos-

<sup>27</sup> Erica García (personal communication).

sible' domains, the latter sometimes identified with the negation of the statement. The speaker selects among this 'range of epistemic possibilities' (Eddington, 1987)<sup>28</sup> according to his/her attitude toward the realization of the event. He/she personally assigns a degree of confidence ('chance') to the realization of what s/he is asserting, and he transmits it to his/her addressee (García, see fn. 27). This is a question of *epistemic probability*, more than of logical truth, or of objective certainty.

In the case of Mapudungun, the canonical forms of the conditionals (29) as well as those of dubitatives and desideratives (25)–(27) may be ordered from lower to higher epistemic probability, according to the occurrence/or not of *-Fi*. A special case of M1 is manifested in utterances with verbs + *-pe* 'EVID' affected by *-Fi* (Golluscio, 1996a), since evidentials are explicit epistemic markers.<sup>29</sup>

#### 4.2. Agent-Oriented Modalities (M2)<sup>30</sup>

Regarding M2, the presence of *-Fi* affects a wide scope of *agent-oriented modalities* (which include desire – or wish – as well as willingness, intention, and purpose as the extreme end of intention) pragmatically implicated by some utterances of the corpus. Unlike epistemic modality, the agent-oriented modalities mentioned above do not manifest themselves in every case considered in this analysis. They appear in Group I.A (+ purpose-implicating utterances), in some cases of Group I.B (subgroup 2.a, Verbs governing intention), as well as in some utterances of Group II, especially those bearing a desiderative illocutionary marker. Then, the cases categorized as Group I.B (– purpose-implicating utterances) as well as the conditionals, concessives, and dubitatives of Group II would be the least favorable for expressing M2.

#### 4.3. Remarks on *-Fi* and modality

First, although desiderative, and desiderative-dubitative utterances mainly manifest some kind of agent-oriented modality (M2), they simultaneously express the degree of probability of realization the speaker assigns to the assertion (M1). Conversely, conditionals, concessives, and dubitatives, as well as assertive utterances + *-Fi*, at the same time that they appear located in the lowest places on the epistemic scale (M1), they express nuances related to M2.

Second, data personally collected in fieldwork reveal that even in those types of contexts, the presence of *-Fi* is associated by the consultants with the personal speaker's commitment. Perla Golbert (personal communication) recorded comments from her consultants in that sense. For example, during the performance of a tale (Golbert, 1975), after a fragment of discourse which included a Verb + *-Fi*, the per-

<sup>28</sup> Eddington's proposal focuses on conditionals. In this work, I extend it also to dubitative and desiderative sentences as well as polite requests and rhetorical questions.

<sup>29</sup> Following Chung and Timberlake (1985), the speaker's selection of *-pe* would be a case of epistemological modality, that is, the derived mode related to epistemic modality that more clearly involves a source (in this case, the speaker).

<sup>30</sup> Regarding this point, I assume Joan Bybee's perspective (see Bybee et al., 1994). For discussion about deontic modality and agent- and speaker-oriented modalities, see Bybee and Fleischman (1995).

former added the following commentary about the character: ‘He said that compassionately’. In some examples of my corpus, the ‘non-attained intention’ is not only overtly expressed, but specially highlighted by the presence of *-FI*, such as *mawtu-FI-i*, which implicates ‘He wanted to sleep [but he couldn’t]’, *yi-FI-i* ‘He wanted to eat [but he couldn’t]’, and, especially, *la-FI-i* ‘He almost died; he wanted to die [but he didn’t]’.

Finally, if it is considered that:

- a. The domain of Irrealis includes doubt, wish, polite request, and wide scope ranging from possible to counterfactual events (Steele, 1975; Chung and Timberlake, 1985; Palmer, 1985; Mithun, 1986);
- b. A close relationship between Irrealis and remoteness has been postulated (Steele, 1975);
- c. Frustrated wishes and intentions are a special type of Irrealis (Hale, 1969);

then, the verbal suffix *-FI* contributes significantly to the construction of the Irrealis domain in Mapudungun.

### 5. The suffix *-FI* and the Mapuche discourse

The following fragment of the Mapuche narrative called the *Pillañ Ngütram* ‘Story of Pillañ’,<sup>31</sup> shows a relevant example of the use of the verbal suffix *-FI* in discourse:

- (30) a. *ngillatu-FI- i- ngin*  
 pray- IND- 3PL  
 ‘They prayed’.
- (30) b. *aku- la- i ta ti pichi wentru aku- la- i*  
 arrive- NEG- IND (3) AP1 AP2 little man arrive- NEG- IND (3)  
 ‘The little boy did not arrive. He did not arrive.’
- (30) c. *ngillatu- i- ngin kamarikun mew*  
 pray- IND- 3PL camaruco PPOS  
 ‘They prayed in the camaruco.’
- (30) d. *fei mew wula ta aku- i ta ti pichi wentru*  
 thus then AP1 arrive- IND (3) AP1 AP2 little man  
 ‘Thus, then, the boy arrived.’

<sup>31</sup> The complete text of this Mapuche narrative appears in Golluscio (1988). It is a myth about the origin of the *ngellipun*, *ngillatun* or *kamarikun*, the Mapuche community prayer. Thus, it states the importance of performing that ritual and the way it must be carried out. Pillañ is a powerful figure in the Pre-Contact Mapuche cosmology, associated with the fire and the volcanos. Intimately related to Mapuche shamanistic beliefs and practices, Pillañ was one of the main foci of the Catholic priests’ attack on the vernacular religion, from the very beginning.

This narrative tells the story of a little boy who one day, while he was herding sheep, was caught by Pillañ. So, the community began to do *ngillatun*, that is, to pray asking for the return of the boy. The sequence which is transcribed in example (30) corresponds to the episode in which that prayer was performed. However, the prayer had to be repeated because it was not answered immediately: The members of the community who were performing *ngillatun* failed in the first two attempts: the boy did not come. This failure is linguistically marked by the occurrence of *-FI* after the verbal stem *ngillatu-* ‘pray’ – see (30a): *ngillatu-FI-i-ngin* ‘they prayed [but their intention was not fulfilled]’, as it is made explicit in (30b). Conversely, the final accomplishment of the prayer is linguistically marked by the disappearance of *-FI* – see (30c) and (30d).

In this *ngitram*, *-FI* is used by the performer as a stylistic device in the construction of foregrounding. In addition, *-FI* contributes to the *tempo* of the narration. While the storyteller’s introduction of *-FI* bridles the events, its removal allows the story to go on. The interplay between its appearance and disappearance expresses the narrative tension between an unsolved situation and the solution of the conflict.<sup>32</sup>

Hence, the use of the Mapuche verbal suffix *-FI* is relevant not only at sentential level, but especially in discourse. Indeed, its meaning emerges from discourse. And, in keeping with ‘the grammar of poetry and the poetry of grammar’ which Jakobson described (1968: 597–609), the performer’s use of an apparently ‘boring’ morpheme transforms it in a powerful device in the construction of the poetic structuring of a piece of Mapuche verbal art.

## 6. Conclusions

1. If metapragmatic devices are defined as those which comment, evaluate or act over indexical or pragmatic phenomena, the Mapuche verbal suffix *-FI* is a *metapragmatic operator which acts to alert to, interrupt, or rupture conventional implicature in speech*. Whenever *-FI* occurs, the following requirements are fulfilled: a. A close pragmatic relationship (sequentiality or chain of expectation, with different specific properties) is disrupted or frustrated by the presence of *-FI*, with b. the occurrence – or not – of an explicit consequent. This consequent acquires a diverse value from the expected one, sometimes denying it, sometimes implicating an opposite meaning.

In that sense, when the speaker adds *-FI* to a verb in discourse, a process of (counter)inference is triggered in his/her addressee. In other words, a member of the Mapuche speech community knows that the occurrence of *-FI* after the verbal stem means the rupture of some kind of pragmatic relationship created in speech.

As a final reflection on this point, I want to emphasize that the issue at hand is a question of a living language, not of a computer system. Therefore, some of the pragmatic relationships analyzed above in a separate way may and do overlap (some

<sup>32</sup> See the *Nawel Ngitram* ‘The story of the tiger’, another Mapuche narrative, for a similar use of the suffix *-FI* (Golluscio, in press).

sentences could manifest at the same time a temporal contiguity relationship and some type of causation, for example). In addition, in natural discourse other pragmatic associations not treated in this work may and do appear. However, the meaning of *-FI* as a non-referential, but specifically indexical marker remains constant throughout.

2. These contextual meanings, then, manifest the function of *-FI* as a marker of the speaker's subjective evaluation. In this sense, a double orientation of that speaker's evaluation arises from the analysis of the examples taken into account. The speaker chooses the use of *-FI* in discourse as a linguistic device to transmit the following to his audience:

a. *The low degree of epistemic probability assigned by him/herself to the events he/she is talking about.* In that sense, *-FI* acts as a 'de-realizer', that is, a subjective marker of evaluation of reality towards degrees of less probability reaching counterfactuality at its extreme point. Furthermore, its presence implies, in a significant number of cases, a kind of attenuated negation of what is stated, a circumstance which appears sometimes explicitly asserted in the consequent.

b. *His/her indexing some specific type of agent-oriented modality which appears affected and, at the same time, highlighted by -FI.* This aspect is recognized in the majority of the examples of Group II (+ suffix *-a* 'FUT'), and in the verbs of Group I.A which create a conventional implicature of purpose, intimately linked with volition, in speech. As distinguished from the *epistemic probability*, related to M1 and present in the totality of the corpus considered in this paper, only certain specific contexts favor the manifestation of some *agent-oriented modalities* (M2) especially associated with volition and desire.

3. *The suffix -FI appears specially linked with the three-dimensional Tense-Aspect-Modality relationships in Mapudungun.* In connection with *temporal* meanings, the analysis of the data makes comprehensible the traditional interpretation of *-FI* as a Past marker. In general, the pragmatic rupture that the presence of this verbal suffix produces and the speaker's evaluation of what he/she is telling create a close, but not automatic, relationship of *-FI* with past events or states.

In this sense, the co-occurrence of *-ke* 'DURATIVE/HABITUAL' + *-FI*, syntactically associated with the adverb *kwifi* 'in ancient times', immediately places the utterance in a remote past domain, and makes it specially apt for the narration of mythic events or *kwifike dungu* 'ancient words'.

Regarding the *aspectual* domain, *-FI* generally triggers contextual meanings related to completion, that is, to perfectly or definitely finished events or to events which come to conclusion by the presence of *-FI*, as opposed to the imperfective meanings of the same verbal forms without *-FI*.

Finally, this suffix appears enrolled in the *modality* domain of this language. The combination of the meaning of *-FI* as a marker of alerting to, blocking, or rupturing conventional implicature in speech and its consequent task in indexing the speaker's subjective evaluation results in a close relationship between the occurrence of *-FI* and the Irrealis domain in Mapudungun. This linking of *-FI* with Irrealis places this grammatical marker at one end of the Tense-Aspect-Modality continuum which organizes the Mapuche verbal system.



## References

- Arguedas, José María, 1968. No soy un aculturado. In: José María Arguedas, *El zorro de arriba y el zorro de abajo*, 281–283. Buenos Aires: Losada.
- Arnold, Jennifer, 1996. The inverse system in Mapudungun and other languages. *Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 34: 9–48, Concepción, Chile: Universidad de Concepción.
- Augusta, Fray Félix José de, 1903. *Gramática Araucana*. Valdivia: Lampert.
- Augusta, Fray Félix José de, 1915. *Diccionario Araucano-Español y Español-Araucano*. Padre Las Casas: San Francisco.
- Bello, Andrés, 1925 [1847]. *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. Paris: Blot.
- Bello, Andrés and R. Cuervo, 1847. *Gramática de la lengua española*. Paris: Blot.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins and William Pagliuca, 1994. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Bybee, Joan and Suzanne Fleischman, eds., 1995. *Modality in grammar and discourse (Typological studies in language 32)*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Censo Indígena Nacional, 1968. Tomo I: Resultados definitivos, 1966–1968. Buenos Aires: Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos.
- Chung, Sandra and Alan Timberlake, 1985. Tense, aspect, and mood. In: Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 3, 202–258. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard, 1983. *Conditionals: A typology*. Ms. prepared for the Conditionals Conference, Stanford University.
- Croese, Robert, 1984. Tiempo verbal en mapudungun, *Actas Jornadas de Lengua y Literatura Mapuche (29–31 agosto 1984)*. Convenio Universidad de la Frontera e Instituto Lingüístico de Verano: 64–76. Temuco: Imprenta Kúme dungu.
- Croese, Robert, Adalberto Salas and Gastón Sepúlveda, 1978. Proposición de un sistema unificado de transcripción fonémica para el mapudungu. *Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 16: 151–160.
- Dámaso Vieyra, Vieyra, Marcia, 1994. A derivação da incorporação nominal na língua Tupinambá (Tupí-guaraní). *Actas de III Jornadas de Lingüística Aborigen*: 225–233. Buenos Aires: Instituto de Lingüística, Universidad de Buenos Aires.
- Eddington, Dorothy, 1987. Do conditionals have true conditions? *Crítica* 52: 3–39.
- Fava, J., 1991. Argentina: Reforma constitucional y política indigenista. *Boletín, IWGIA*, July–August, 1: 21–27.
- Fernández Garay, Ana, 1981. Algunos sufijos verbales mapuches. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Etnolingüísticos* 1: 5–25.
- Fernández Garay, Ana, 1998. Afijos y modalidades en el verbo ranquel. In: Lucía A. Golluscio and Yosuke Kuramochi, eds., *Lingüística y literatura mapuches: Aproximaciones desde ambos lados de los Andes*: 19–34. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires and Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile.
- Fishman, Joshua, 1981. Language maintenance and ethnicity. *Canadian Review of Studies in Nationalism* 8: 229–248.
- Foster, Michael K., 1986. Updating the terminology of tense, mood, and aspect in Northern Iroquoian descriptions. *IJAL* 52(1): 65–71.
- Givón, Talmy, ed., 1994. *Voice and Inversion*, *Typological Studies in language*, 28. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Golbert de Goodbar, Perla, 1975. *Epu peñiwen (Los dos hermanos)*. Buenos Aires: CICE.
- Golluscio, Lucía, 1983–1985. *Esquema gramatical del araucano: Advanced Fellowship Final Report for CONICET (National Council for Scientific and Technological Research, Argentina)*. Ms.
- Golluscio, Lucía, 1988. *El sistema verbal araucano II: Relaciones tiempo-modo-aspecto*. In: *La comunicación etnolingüística en comunidades mapuches de la Argentina*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Universidad Nacional de La Plata.
- Golluscio, Lucía, 1990a. La imagen del dominador en la literatura oral mapuche y su relación con lo 'no dicho', una estrategia de resistencia cultural. *Annales littéraires de l'Université de Franche-Comté (Besançon): Hommage à Jaime Díaz-Rozzotto (special volume)* 416: 695–707.

- Golluscio, Lucía, 1990b. Frustration and non-reality: An approach to the Araucanian verbal system. Paper presented at the 49th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, New Orleans.
- Golluscio, Lucía, 1996a. Metapragmatic operators in Mapudungun: More about realis–irrealis. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, San Diego, January.
- Golluscio, Lucía, 1996b. Grammatical operators rupturing implicature: The case of Mapudungun. Paper presented at the 5th International Pragmatics Conference, Mexico, July.
- Golluscio, Lucía, 1998. Aspecto verbal en mapudungun. In: Lucía A. Golluscio and Yosuke Kuramochi, eds., *Lingüística y literatura mapuches: Aproximaciones desde ambos lados de los Andes*, 35–47. Buenos Aires: Universidad de Buenos Aires and Universidad Católica de Temuco, Chile.
- Golluscio, Lucía, in press. From the Nawel Ngíttram to the 'Story of the tiger': Issues in the translation of Mapuche verbal art. In: Kay Sammons and Joel Sherzer, eds., *Translating native Latin American verbal art: Ethnopoetics and ethnography of speaking*. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Gregores, Emma, 1974. Informe sobre el estado de las lenguas indígenas en la Argentina: Documento de Trabajo. Ms. Buenos Aires: CICE.
- Grice, H.P., 1975. Logic and conversation. In: D. Davidson and G. Harman, eds.: 64–75. Encino, California: Dickenson.
- Grimes, Joseph E., 1975. The thread of discourse. The Hague: Mouton.
- Grimes, Joseph E., 1985. Topic inflexion in Mapudungun verbs. *IJAL* 51(2): 141–163.
- Hale, Kenneth, 1969. Papago/ci-m. Cambridge, MA: MIT. Cited by Frank Palmer (1986: 212).
- Harmelink, Brian, 1988. The expression of temporal distinctions in Mapudungun. *Lenguas Modernas* 15: 125–130.
- Havestadt, Bernard, 1777. *Chilidungu sive tractatus linguae chilensis*. Facsimile edition by Julio Platzmann, 1888. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Hockett, Charles, 1966. What Algonquian is really like. *IJAL* 32: 59–73.
- Hymes, Dell, 1981. 'In vain I tried to tell you': Essays in Native American ethnopoetics. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas. República de Chile, 1993. Informe Oficial Censo Nacional 1992. Santiago de Chile: INE.
- Jakobson, Roman, 1968. Poetry of grammar and grammar of poetry. *Lingua* 21: 597–609.
- Karttunen, Lauri and Stanley Peters, 1979. Conventional implicature. In: C.-K. Oh and D.A. Dinneen, eds., *Presupposition (Syntax and semantics 11)*, 1–56. New York: Academic Press.
- Kaufman, Terrence, 1990. Language history in South America: What we know and how to know more. In: Doris Payne, ed., *Amazonian linguistics: Studies in lowland South American languages*, 3–74. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Lenz, Rodolfo, 1944. *La oración y sus partes: Estudios de gramática general y castellana*. Fourth edition. Santiago de Chile: Nascimento.
- Longacre, Robert, 1985. Sentences as combination of clauses. In: Timothy Shopen, ed., *Language typology and syntactic description*, vol 2: 235–286. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John, 1977. *Semantics*, vol. 1 and 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mithun, Marianne, 1995. On the relativity of irreality. In: Joan Bybee and Suzanne Fleischman, eds., *Modality in grammar and discourse*, 367–388. *Typological Studies in Language*, 32. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Palmer, Frank R., 1986. *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paulson, S., 1990. Diálogo con doble significado en los Andes: Discurso ambiguo como medio de sobrevivencia por contacto. In: Ellen Basso and Joel Sherzer, eds., *Las culturas latinoamericanas a través de su discurso*, Quito: ABYA-YALA.
- Payne, Doris, 1993. The Tupf-Guaraní inverse. In: Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper, eds., *Typological Studies in Language*, 27: 313–340. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Puschmann, W.H., 1984. Sobre la enseñanza de la gramática a estudiantes bilingües de Chile. *Actas Jornadas de Lengua y Literatura Mapuche* (29–31 agosto 1984). Convenio Universidad de la Frontera e Instituto Lingüístico de Veraoño: 51–63. Temuco: Editorial Küme dungu.
- Salas, Adalberto, 1970. Notas sobre el verbo en el mapuche de Chile (II). *Stylo* 10: 19–34.

- Salas, Adalberto, 1974. Notas sobre el verbo en el mapuche de Chile (VI). *Revista de Lingüística Teórica y Aplicada* 12: 49–88.
- Salas, Adalberto, 1978. Semantic ramifications of the category of person in the Mapuche verb. Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Salas, Adalberto, 1984. Textos orales en mapuche o araucano del Centro-Sur de Chile. Col. *Lenguas vernáculas de Chile* 1. Concepción: Universidad de Concepción.
- Salas, Adalberto, 1992. *El mapuche o araucano de Chile*. Madrid: Mapfre.
- Saugy, Catalina, 1984. Los mapuches argentinos en la actualidad. *Relaciones* 11: 25–38.
- Silverstein, Michael, 1993. Metapragmatic discourse and metapragmatic function. In: John Lucy, ed., *Reflexive language: Reported speech and metapragmatics*, 33–58. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smeets, Catharina, 1989. A Mapuche grammar. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Leyden.
- Smith, Carlota, 1991. *The parameter of aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Sociedad Chilena de Lingüística, 1988. *Alfabeto Mapuche Unificado*. Temuco: Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile.
- Steele, Susan, 1975. Past and irrealis: Just what does it all mean. *IJAL* 41(1): 200–217.
- Valdivia, Luis de, 1606. *Arte y gramática general de la lengua que corre en todo el Reyno de Chile con su vocabulario y confesionario compuesto por el Padre Luis de Valdivia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Provincia del Perú*, Lima. Facsimile edition by Platzmann, 1887. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language 1914. New York-Avenel, New Jersey: Gramercy Books.

**Luciřona A. Golluscio** is currently engaged in a collective research on “South American Indian languages” and in an interdisciplinary project on “Constructing alterity. A discourse-centered approach to belonging and exclusion”. Her recent publications include, “Notes the ‘Nawel Ngıtram’ to the ‘Story of the Tiger’: Issues in the Translation of Mapuche Verbal Art” (in press), and “Pragmatics and Metapragmatics of Belonging and Becoming amongst the Mapuche of Argentina” (with Claudia Briones).

**Publication information:** *Journal of Pragmatics* (ISSN 0378-2166). For 2000, volume 32 is scheduled for publication. Subscription prices are available upon request from the Publisher or from the Regional Sales Office nearest you or from this journal's website (<http://www.elsevier.nl/locate/pragma>). Further information is available on this journal and other Elsevier Science products through Elsevier's website: (<http://www.elsevier.nl>). Subscriptions are accepted on a prepaid basis only and are entered on a calendar year basis. Issues are sent by standard mail (surface within Europe, air delivery outside Europe). Priority rates are available upon request. Claims for missing issues should be made within six months of the date of dispatch. *Subscriptions at special reduced rate for members of the IPrA:* Previously, the IPrA Secretariat has collected orders and payment for these reduced rate subscriptions from its members and subsequently sent these to Elsevier Science B.V. for further handling. IPrA members may order these subscriptions **directly** from Elsevier Science B.V.

Claims for missing issues must be made within six months of our publication (mailing) date. For orders, claims, product enquiries (no manuscript enquiries) please contact the Customer Support Department at the Regional Sales Office nearest to you:

**New York**, Elsevier Science, B.O. Box 945, New York, NY 10159-0945, USA. Tel: (+1) 212-633-3730 [Toll Free number for North American Customers: 1-888-4ES-INFO (437-4636)], Fax: (+1) 212-633-3680, E-mail: [usinfo-f@elsevier.com](mailto:usinfo-f@elsevier.com)

**Amsterdam**, Elsevier Science, P.O. Box 211, 1000 AE Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Tel: (+31) 20-485-3757, Fax: (+31) 20-485-3432, E-mail: [nlinfo-f@elsevier.nl](mailto:nlinfo-f@elsevier.nl)

**Tokyo**, Elsevier Science K.K., 9-15, Higashi-Azabu 1-chome, Minato-ku, Tokyo 106-0044, Japan. Tel: (+ 81) 3-5561-5033, Fax: (+81) 3-5561-5047, E-mail: [info@elsevier.co.jp](mailto:info@elsevier.co.jp)

**Singapore**, Elsevier Science; No. 1 Temasek Avenue, #17-01 Millenia Tower, Singapore 039192. Tel: (+65) 434-3727, Fax: (+65) 337-2230, E-mail: [asiainfo@elsevier.com.sg](mailto:asiainfo@elsevier.com.sg)

**Rio de Janeiro**, Elsevier Science, Rua Sete de Setembro 111/16 Andar, 20050-002 Centro, Rio de Janeiro – RJ, Brazil; phone: (+55) (21) 509 5340; fax: (+55) (21) 507 1991; e-mail: [elsevier@campus.com.br](mailto:elsevier@campus.com.br) [Note (Latin America): for orders, claims and help desk information, please contact the Regional Sales Office in New York as listed above]

**US mailing notice – Journal of Pragmatics** (0378-2166) is published 13 times yearly, by Elsevier Science B.V. (Molenwerf 1, Postbus 211, 1000 AE Amsterdam). Annual subscription price in the USA US \$688.00 (US \$ price valid in North, Central and South America only), including air speed delivery. Periodicals postage paid at Jamaica, NY 1143. USA POSTMASTERS: Send address changes to Journal of Pragmatics, Publication Expediting, Inc., 200 Meacham Avenue, Elmont, NY 11003. Air freight and mailing in the USA by Publication Expediting.

**Advertising information.** Advertising orders and enquiries can be sent to:

**USA, Canada and South America:** Mr Tino de Carlo, The Advertising Department, Elsevier Science Inc., 655 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10010-5107, USA; phone: (+1) (212) 633 3815; fax: (+1) (212) 633 3820; e-mail: [t.decarlo@elsevier.com](mailto:t.decarlo@elsevier.com).

**Japan:** The Advertising Department, Elsevier Science K.K., 9-15 Higashi-Azabu 1-chome, Minato-ku, Tokyo 106-0044, Japan; phone (+81) (3) 5561 5033; fax: (+81) (3) 5561 5047.

**Europe and ROW:** Rachel Leveson-Gower, The Advertising Department, Elsevier Science Ltd., Tge Boulevard, Langford Lane, Kidlington, Oxford OX5 1GB, UK; phone: (+44) (1865) 843565; fax: (+44) (1865) 843976; e-mail: [r.leveson-gower@elsevier.co.uk](mailto:r.leveson-gower@elsevier.co.uk)

© The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper). Printed in The Netherlands