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1 Introduction

- In this talk, we investigate three morphological reflexes of Ā-dependencies in Caquinte, a Kampa Arawak language of southeastern Peru spoken by fewer than 500 people (Castillo Ramírez 2017; Swift 1988)\(^1\)

> This is the first theoretical treatment of Ā-related effects in any Kampa Arawak language\(^2\)

1. **Anti-agreement**, the loss of agreement\(^3\)

2. **Special irrealis marking**

3. **Special aspect marking** with intransitive subject extraction

(1) a. Inkorakeke.
   i-\(\text{N}\) korake-\(\text{K}\) -e
   3M.S-IRR-come -PFV-IRR
   He will come.

b. Koraketankitsineka
   korake-\(\text{ankits}\)i-\(\text{ne}\)=ka
   come -PFV -?IRR =REL
   the one who will come

- Each reflex has a different distribution as to which types of argument extraction that trigger it (Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflex</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-agreement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrealis -ne</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special aspect</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Data comes from elicitation and a corpus of approximately 8,000 lines developed by Zachary O’Hagan as part of ongoing fieldwork in the Caquinte community of Kitepámpani begun in 2011. We thank speakers Antonina Salazar Torres, Joy Salazar Torres, Emilia Sergio Salazar, and Miguel Sergio Salazar for their patience, generosity, willingness, and enthusiasm in sharing their language with us. Financial support for fieldwork has come from two Oswalt Endangered Language grants (2014, 2015) and an Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (ELDP) Individual Graduate Scholarship (2016-present). Documentary materials are archived with the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages and are available online: http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.7297/X24M92P6.

2. See Stark (2012) and Sheil (2013) for discussion of extraction morphology in Garifuna.

3. Epenthetic segments /t/ and /a/, which repair vowel and consonant hiatus, respectively, are not represented in the segmentation. Abbreviations: \(A\) = applicative; \(ABL\) = ablativ; \(ACT\) = active; \(ALL\) = allative; \(ALT\) = alternative; \(AM\) = associated motion; \(AUG\) = augmentative; \(CE\) = counter-expectational; \(CF\) = counterfactual; \(CL\) = classifier; \(CNGR\) = congruent; \(COP\) = copula; \(D\) = demonstrative; \(DIR\) = directional; \(DISTR\) = distributive; \(DUR\) = durative; \(EPS\) = epistemic; \(F\) = feminine; \(FOC\) = focus; \(FRUST\) = frustrating; \(IDEO\) = ideophone; \(INCL\) = inclusive; \(INCR\) = incongruent; \(INSTR\) = instrumental; \(IRR\) = irrealis; \(LOC\) = locative; \(M\) = masculine; \(MAL\) = malefactive; \(ME\) = male ego; \(MED\) = medial; \(MID\) = middle; \(NEG\) = negation; \(O\) = object; \(P\) = possessor; \(PFV\) = perfective; \(PERSP\) = perspectival; \(PL\) = plural; \(POSS\) = possessive; \(PRO\) = pro-form; \(R\) = realis; \(REG\) = regressive; \(REL\) = relativizer; \(S\) = subject; \(TOP\) = topic.
- We argue that all three of these reflexes are best analyzed as forms of *wh*-agreement
  ▷ All three effects emerge as the morphological result of a head on the clausal spine agreeing with the extracted XP for the feature involved in triggering Ā-movement in *wh*-questions, relative clauses, and focus
  ▷ We label this feature [op]\(^4\)
- Specifically, we show that all three reflexes fall out straightforwardly from Baier’s (in prep) analysis of anti-/*wh*-agreement as morphological impoverishment triggered by Ā-features, followed by insertion of a more underspecified morpheme

2 Agreement, voice and reality status background
- Caquinte is VSO, strongly head-marking, largely agglutinative, and has extensive argument drop
- We briefly lay out the important verbal categories in Caquinte that will be central to the discussion of extraction morphology below, as well as discussing our basic analysis of Caquinte clause structure
- Verbs in Caquinte are minimally marked for the following categories
  1. Subject *φ*-agreement
  2. Reality status → REALIS vs. IRREALIS (negative, future, counterfactual)
  3. Aspect → IMPERFECTIVE vs. PERFECTIVE
  4. Voice → ACTIVE vs. MIDDLE
- In addition, transitive verbs may inflect for object *φ*-agreement (which shows differential marking)

\begin{quote}
(2) Ari otiakero\(^5\) Shomoshiki inkomerikanate...

\begin{verbatim}
ari  [0]-tig  -k  -i  ro  Shomoshiki  [0]-inkomerikanate-
tig thus 3F.S-cook-PFV-R:ACT-3F.O  Shomoshiki  3F.P-pepper  -poss
\end{verbatim}

Then Shomoshiki cooked her *aji* peppers...
\end{quote}
- Preverbal argument positions for topics and foci are available
- A template showing the positions of these categories within the verb is shown in (3)

\begin{quote}
(3) Partial Caquinte verbal template

\begin{verbatim}
subj.agr - (irr) - v - aspect - voice+reality - (obj.agr)
\end{verbatim}
\end{quote}
▷ Subject *φ*-agreement prefixes occur directly before the stem and distinguish person and gender

\(4\). We use the [op] instead of [wh] because, as we will see, these effects are triggered in more than just *wh*-questions. We assume that the class of Ā-features is itself internally complex and hierarchically structured, and that [op] is one of these features (see Abels 2012 and Aravind 2017 for discussion).

\(5\). In Caquinte and most other Kampa languages, a morphophonological rule exists whereby realis active -\(i\) lowers to [e] following perfective -k. We show [e] in the first line of exemplification, and underlying -\(i\) elsewhere. Note, however, that for active, perfective verbs that lack an irrealis prefix (see below), the reality status contrast is neutralized.
Table 2: Subject agreement prefixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1INCL</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3M</th>
<th>3F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REALIS</td>
<td>n(o)-</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>p(i)-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>(o)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREALIS</td>
<td>no-N-</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>pi-N-</td>
<td>ir(i)- / i-N-</td>
<td>o-N-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Irrealis** clauses are marked with a prefix, the placeless nasal N-, as shown in (4b)

> (4) a. Naatimpakea nokijaji ishikoiñaŋaki.  
naatinpa no-kij -aj -ŋ  
1:TOP 1S- enter-REG-R:ACT school =LOC  
I entered school again. (gtk)

b. ...“Jeeje, aapani, nonkoraketaje nonkijaje...”  
jeje aapani no-[N] korake-aj -e no-[N] kij -aj -e  
yes father 1S-IRR-come -REG-IRR 1S-IRR-enter-REG-IRR  
...“Yes, father, I’m going to come back and enter [school] again...” (gtk)

- We assume that the subject ϕ-agreement probe and reality status features are located on T

> (5) **Features on T**

a. Realis T = [uϕ, -IRR]

b. Irrealis T = [uϕ, +IRR]

- **Aspect** marking is the first obligatory suffix position, distinguishing IMPERFECTIVE and PERFECTIVE

> In clauses without intransitive subject extraction, imperfective is Ø-marked, while perfective is marked with the suffix -k

> (6) **Aspect marking**

a. Ikorakeke.  
i- korake-[k] -i  
3M.S-come -PFV-R:ACT  
He came.

b. Ikoraketi.  
i- korake-[Ø] -i  
3M.S-come -IPFV-R:ACT  
He is coming.

- We take aspect to be hosted on an Asp head directly above vP

---

6. If the verbal root does not begin with a voiceless stop or affricate, N- deletes
- Following the aspect suffix there is a suffix slot that multiple expones reality status and voice, a category separate from transitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>MIDDLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REALIS</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREALIS</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-e-Npa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- There are two separate suffixes that fuse realis with one of each of the voice categories

  ▷ Transitive verbs often end in -i in the realis (7a)
  ▷ Such verbs often seem to be detransitivized by switching their suffix to -a as shown with the reflexive example in (7b), and we thus refer to them as middle
  ▷ However, such middle verbs can still take direct objects, as shown in (7c)

  (7) a. Okitsaajiakeri...
      3F.S-dress -PL-PFV-R:ACT-3M.O
      She dressed them... (kap)

  b. ...aisa oroatinpa okitsaaka.
      3F:TOP 3F.S-dress -PFV-R:MID
      ...she also got dressed. (kap)

  c. ...oitsaare okitsaatjaro.
      3F.F-dress -NOMZ 3F.S-dress -REG-R:MID-3F.O
      ...[then she grabbed] her cushma and put it on [i.e., herself]. (kat)

- In the irrealis, fusion is no longer present (general irrealis -e) and middle is exponed separately via -Npa

- Many verbal roots show the productive active-middle alternation; others are invariably active or middle (e.g., sheka ‘eat’); others are middle in the realis and active in the irrealis (e.g., mir ‘drink’); and all are obligatorily middle in the presence of certain specified verbal suffixes (not exemplified here)

- We take the active/middle distinction to be a property of the head Voice, which also hosts transitivity features

- We therefore assume that there are four ‘flavors’ of Voice

(8) Flavors of Voice

  a. Transitive, active = [+TR, -MID, uϕ]
  b. Transitive, middle = [+TR, +MID, uϕ]
  c. Intransitive, active = [-TR, -MID]
  d. Intransitive, middle = [-TR, +MID]
Transitive Voice is [+TR(Ansitive)] and carries a $\varphi$-probe for object agreement, while intransitive voice is [-TR] and carries no probe.

Active Voice is [-MID(DLE)] and middle Voice is [+MID].

The clausal spine that we assume for Caquinte is given in (9) for a transitive clause.

(9) The clausal spine (and agreement)

1. The $\varphi$-probe on T agrees with the subject DP in Spec-VoiceP
2. The $\varphi$-probe on Voice agrees with the subject DP in VP

To derive the fact that Voice also expones reality status, we propose that T shares its reality status feature with Voice, as shown in (10).

(10) Sharing [±IRR] between T and Voice

- V undergoes head movement to T, deriving VSO. The verb is linearized as shown in (11).

(11) Linearization after head movement

$T_{[\varphi;SBJ, ±IRR]} - V - v - Asp - Voice_{[±TR, ±MID, ±IRR, (\varphi;obj)]}$
3 Anti-agreement

- Caquente has a focus construction in which a DP is fronted to a preverbal position⁷

- In such cases, the verb obligatorily lacks agreement morphology corresponding to the focused argument

(12) a. Abiatimpa pishinebempojempari...  
   \[\text{abiati} \text{p} \text{p} \text{ben} \text{poj} \text{e} \text{n-pa-ri} \]
   \[\text{2:top} \text{2s-be.happy-APPL-ALL-Irr-MID-3.0} \]
   You will like them... (kap)

b. "...Abirokea anaakena."
   \[\text{abiro} \text{ke} \text{a} \text{anag} \text{e} \text{i} \text{n-pa} \]
   \[\text{2:fo} \text{c}=\text{evid} \text{defeat-PFV-R:ACT-1o} \]
   "...You've defeated me." (kch2)

(13) a. "Imaika abiatimpa nantsipetakaakempi..."
   \[\text{imaika} \text{abiati} \text{n} \text{pa} \text{no-N-atsipe-akag-k-e-Npi} \]
   \[\text{now} \text{2:top} \text{1s-Irr-suffer-CAUS-PFV-Irr-2o} \]
   "Now I will make you suffer..." (kap)

b. "...abiro noshekatakempa."
   \[\text{abiro} \text{no-sheka-ak-e-Npa} \]
   \[\text{2:fo} \text{c} \text{1s-eat-PFV-Irr-MID} \]
   "...I will eat you." (ank)

- Most examples of anti-agreement here involve the focus pronouns shown in (12b) and (13b), but anti-agreement also occurs in wh-questions (14) and relative clauses (15)⁸

(14) Wh-questions

a. "Taate katsimatakaakenpi?"
   \[\text{taa} \text{te} \text{katsima-akag-k-i-Npi} \]
   \[\text{wh}=\text{ce} \text{be.angry-CAUS-PFV-R:ACT-2o} \]
   ..."Who’s made you [so] angry?" (kat)

b. "Taakeate inkajaranki pobetsabaetaka...?"
   \[\text{taa} \text{ke} \text{a} \text{te} \text{inkajaranki-pi-obetsa-bae-ak-a} \]
   \[\text{wh}=\text{evid=ce} \text{previously} \text{2s-speak-DUR-PFV-R-MID} \]
   ..."Who were you speaking to before for so long...?" (vam)

---

7. Recall that topics are also fronted, but they do not have the same morphological effect regarding agreement, as shown below.
8. Relative clauses may be headed or headless.
Relative clauses

a. ...ikorakejiake [chookatsika Pichaki]$_{\text{REL}}$
   
i- korake-jig-k -i  [\text{CP} \text{Op} \text{chooka-ats} -i =\text{ka} \text{Picha=ki} ]
3M.S-come -PL-PFV-R:ACT reside -IPFV-R:ACT=REL Picha=LOC
...came those who resided on the Picha River. (ama)

b. ...“Imaika teronkaka maasano [nonetsanakeka].”$_{\text{REL}}$
   
imaika teronk-k -a -Ø maasano  [\text{CP} \text{Op} \text{no-netsana-k} -i =\text{ka} ]
now finish -PFV-R:MID-3s everything 1s- arrange-PFV-R:ACT=REL
...“Now everything I arranged has run out.” (kev)

- Relative clauses in Caquinte require the presence of a relative second-position enclitic =ka that attaches to the verb when it is initial inside the RC – we assume that =ka is a relative C head.

- The lack of subject agreement in (12)–(15) cannot simply be a cooccurrence restriction between preverbal subjects and overt agreement, as the preverbal topics must be indexed by agreement (cf. example 12a, above

Anti-agreement is triggered by a subset of preverbal Ā-subjects → the feature responsible for extraction matters → [\text{Op}] requires anti-agreement, [\text{TOP}] does not

- We argue, following Baier (in prep), that anti-agreement arises from the configuration in (16), where a ϕ-probe on H finds a DP with both ϕ- and Ā-features.

Configuration for anti-agreement

[ ... H$_{[\text{uϕ}]}$ [ ... DP$_{[\text{ϕ, Ā}]}$ ... ]

- In Caquinte, this configuration will arise for subject extraction (between T and the subject) and for object extraction (between Voice and the object)

Subject extraction

Object extraction

Lack of agreement morphology in this configuration arises because of impoverishment (Bonet 1991; Noyer 1992, 1997; Halle and Marantz 1993) of the ϕ-features in the morphology

9. We assume that =ka cliticizes to the verb via the processes described in Rolle and O’Hagan (2018).
10. Baier (in prep) implements this idea with the version of Agree developed by Deal (2016). Deal argues that ϕ-probes copy back more features than they search for. See Baier (2016, in prep) for details.
(19) **Caquinte φ-feature impoverishment**

a. \( [\phi] \rightarrow \emptyset / [\_, \text{op}, T] \)

b. \( [\phi] \rightarrow \emptyset / [\_, \text{op}, \text{Voice}] \)

▷ Rule (19a) derives subject anti-agreement

▷ Rule (19a) derives object anti-agreement

▷ Because the rules refer to [op] and not [top], we derive the difference between topicalization and operator movement

- The impoverishment rule in (19) will result in the following change to T and Voice’s feature bundles

(20) **Results of impoverishment at T and Voice**

a. \([\phi]:\text{val, } \pm \text{irr}, \text{op}, T] \rightarrow [\pm \text{irr}, \text{op}, T]\)

b. \([\phi]:\text{val, } \pm \text{tr}, \pm \text{mid}, \pm \text{irr}, \text{op}, \text{Voice}] \rightarrow [\pm \text{tr}, \pm \text{mid}, \pm \text{irr}, \text{op}, \text{Voice}]\)

- Because impoverishment occurs before vocabulary insertion, the rule in (19) will block any agreement prefix from being spelled out at T – there will simply be no \( \phi \)-features to realize

- In Caquinte, this results in the appearance of no subject agreement prefix

4 **Exponence of [+irr] in subject extraction contexts**

- Non-extraction contexts → reality status is exponed as a suffix

- If the clause is irrealis, there is also a prefix (under the right morphophonological conditions)

(21) a. Naatimpakea nokijaji ishikoĩαι.  
    naatinpa no-kij -aj \( _{[}] \) ishikoĩa=ki  
    1:TOP 1S-enter-REG-[R:ACT] school =LOC  
    I entered school again. (gtk)

b. ...“Jeeje, aapani, nonkoraketaje nonkijaje...”  
    jeeje aapani no-[N]- korake-aj \( _{[}] \) no-[N]- kij -aj \( _{[}] \)  
    yes father 1S-[IRR]-come -REG-[IRR] 1S-[IRR]-enter-REG-[IRR]  
    ...“Yes, father, I’m going to come back and enter [school] again...” (gtk)

- Recall further that reality status features are generated on T – after \( \phi \)-feature impoverishment takes place, they are still present on T

(22) **Results of impoverishment at T**

\([\phi]:\text{val, } \pm \text{irr}, \text{op}, T] \rightarrow [\pm \text{irr}, \text{op}, T]\)

- **Question:** How is irrealis exponed in contexts where \( \phi \)-impoverishment has taken place? Do we still see two exponents of [+irr] in these contexts?

▷ In subject extraction contexts, if the verb is irrealis, the prefix \( N \)- cannot occur
In subject extraction contexts, **we find a different, second exponent of** \([+\text{IRR}] \rightarrow -ne\)

- The suffix \(-ne\) occurs in the last suffix position of the verb.

Examples of the irrealis suffix \(-ne\) are shown in (23)

(23) a. …iriokea aagetenajiro inchakijipae.  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{irio} = \text{kea ag -ge -an -aj -i } \rightarrow \text{ inchakij = pae} \\
3M: FOC = \text{EVID take-DISTR-ABL-REG-R:ACT-3F.O stick} = \text{PL}
\end{array}
\]  
...they gathered the sticks back one by one. (shm)

b. "Narokea aanakerine ontaniki Tsonkatagaroniki."  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{naro} = \text{kea ag -an -k e -ri -ne ontaniki Tsonkatagaroni = ki} \\
1: FOC = \text{EVID take-ABL-PFV-IRR-3M.O-IRR over.there Tsonkatagaroni = LOC}
\end{array}
\]  
"I will take him over there to Tsonkatagaroni." (kap)

- We propose that \(-ne\) is an exponent of an irrealis T head with an \([\text{op}]\) feature. Therefore, it will only surface in conditions where T has agreed with a subject that has \([\text{op}]\)

(24) **Vocabulary item for** \(-ne\)  
\([+\text{IRR, op, T}] \leftrightarrow /-ne/\)

5 **Aspect/voice morphology with intransitive subject extraction**

- Intransitive subject extraction has two peculiar effects on aspect and voice morphology in Caquinte.

- When an intransitive subject is extracted, the form of aspect suffixes is different, as shown in (25)

(25) **Aspect morphology with intransitive subject extraction**

a. Ikorakeke.  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
i- \text{ korake} = \text{k -i} \\
3M:L:COME -PFV-R:ACT
\end{array}
\]  
He came.

b. Irio koraketankitsi.  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{irio} \text{ korake} = \text{ankits -i} \\
3M: FOC come -PFV -R:ACT
\end{array}
\]  
He came.

c. Ikoraketi.  
\[
\begin{array}{l}
i- \text{ korake} = \text{0 -i} \\
3M:L:COME -IPFV-R:ACT
\end{array}
\]  
He is coming.
d. Irio koraketatsi. IMPERFECTIVE, SUBJECT EXTRACTION

    irio    korake-[ats]-i
    3m:foC    come    -IPFV-R:ACT

He is coming.

- The form of aspect morphology does not change in transitive clauses, as shown in (26)

   (26) ...“Taate katsimataakenpi?”
       
       taa =te    katsima    -akag-[k]    -i    -npi
       WH=CE    be.angry-CAUS-PFV-R:ACT-2o
       ...“Who’s made you [so] angry?” (kat)

- In addition to the alternation in aspect morphology, the voice/reality status suffix becomes invariable under intran- 
  sitive subject extraction

- As seen in (28), it only occurs as -i, regardless of the notional voice/reality status of the clause

(27) Leveling of the voice-reality status marking

a. “...osheki pitaseake...” NO EXTRACTION, ACTIVE

    osheki    pi-taseg    -[k]    -i
    much    2s-be.hungry-PFV-R:ACT
    “...you’re very hungry...” (pik)

b. “...abirotari taseankitsi.” EXTRACTION, ACTIVE

    abiro =tari    taseg    -[ankits]-i
    2:FOC=because    be.hungry-PFV    -R:ACT
    “...because you’re hungry.” (pik)

c. Oshianakakea sotsiki... NO EXTRACTION, MIDDLE

    o-    shig-an    -[k]    -a
    3f.s-run    -ABL-PFV-R:MF=VID outside

    She ran outside... (kap)

d. “Aato ichookataji shiagebetankitsika.” EXTRACTION, “ACTIVE”

    aato    i-    chooka-aj    -i    shig-ge    -be    -an    -[ankits]-i
    NEG:IRR    3m.s-exst    -REG-R:ACT    run    -DISTR-FRUST-ABL-PFV    -R:ACT=REL

    “No one will escape.” [lit. “There will not exist those who run away.”] (ttk)

- What needs to be explained

  1. What causes the leveling of voice/reality status distinctions

  2. Alternative forms of aspects
Why this only happens in for *intransitive subjects*

- **Accounting for** $\Phi \rightarrow [\text{op}]$ can trigger impoverishment of features other than $[\text{varphi}]$

1. $[\pm \text{IRR}]$ and $[\text{op}]$ shared between $\text{T}$ and $\text{Voice}$

(28)

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{VoiceP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{Voice} \\
\text{SHARING}
\end{array}

\begin{array}{c}
[\varphi, \pm \text{IRR}, \text{op}] \\
[+\text{TR}, \pm \text{MID}, u\varphi, \pm \text{IRR}, \text{op}]
\end{array}
$$

2. Impoverishment targets $\text{Voice}$ as well

(29) **Caquinte Voice impoverishment**

$[-\text{TR}, \pm \text{MID}, \pm \text{IRR}, \text{OP}, \text{Voice}] \rightarrow [-\text{TR}, \text{OP}, \text{Voice}]$

3. We argue that $-i$ is the default spell out of $\text{Voice}$

(30) $[\text{Voice}] \leftrightarrow -i$

4. This explains the leveling of reality status and voice distinctions on intransitives when subject extraction occurs ($\Phi$)

- **Accounting for** $\Phi \rightarrow$ alternative aspectual marking is conditional allomorphy in the context of a $\text{Voice}$ head with the features $[-\text{TR}, \text{OP}]$

(31) **Imperfective allomorphy**

a. $[\text{IMPF, Asp}] \leftrightarrow -\text{ats} / _{-} [-\text{TR}, \text{OP}, \text{Voice}]$

b. $[\text{IMPF, Asp}] \leftrightarrow -\emptyset$

(32) **Imperfective allomorphy**

a. $[\text{PFV, Asp}] \leftrightarrow -\text{ankits} / _{-} [-\text{TR}, \text{OP}, \text{Voice}]$

b. $[\text{PFV, Asp}] \leftrightarrow -\text{k}$

- In this analysis, impoverishment in $\text{Voice}$ is formally separate from allomorphy of aspect

$\Rightarrow$ We might predict that a different pattern of $\text{Voice}$-leveling can occur with the same pattern of aspect allomorphy

$\Rightarrow$ This is borne out by Matsigenka, a related Campa Arawak language

(33) **Matsigenka intransitive subject extraction** (Vargas Pereira et al. 2013)

a. Ipokake sonkvinti pankotsiku...

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{i-} \\
\text{pok} \\
\text{sonkvinti} \\
\text{panko-} \\
\text{tsi} \\
\text{=ku}
\end{array}
$$

3M.S-come-PFV-_-R:ACT bird.sp. house -ALIEN=LOC

The *sonkvinti* bird came to the house...

b. ...irirotari pokankitsu...

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\text{iriro=} \\
\text{tari} \\
\text{pok} \\
\text{ankits} \\
\text{i}
\end{array}
$$

3M =CNGR come-PFV -R:ACT

...it’s because he’s coming...
c. ...iriri iponiaka Pichaku.  
irori=ri  i-  poni  ak[a]  Picha=ku  
3M  =TOP  3M.S-come.from-PFV-R:MID  Picha=LOC  
...he came from the Tambo River.

d. ...virakochaegi poniankicharira parikoti...  
virakocha -egi  poni  ankich[a]  =rira  parikoti  
white.man-PL  come.from-PFV  -MID=REL  far  
...white men who would come from far away...

- In Matsigenka, the active/middle distinction is maintained, while reality status distinctions are leveled
(34) Matsigenka Voice impoverishment  
[-TR, ±MID, ±IRR, OP, Voice] → [-TR, ±MID, OP, Voice]

- The same pattern of allomorphy occurs for aspect → still conditioned by [-TR, OP, VOICE]

6 Conclusion
- We have described and offered analysis for three reflexes of extraction in Caquinte
  1. Anti-agreement
  2. Special irrealis marking
  3. Special aspect marking with intransitive subject extraction

- This is the first theoretical treatment of Ā-related effects in any Kampa Arawak language
- Each of the effects is the result of wh-agreement – a head on the clausal spine, in this case T, agrees for Ā-features.
- These Ā-features later have morphological ramifications
  ▷ Anti-agreement, irrealis -ne, and leveling of voice/reality status result from impoverishment triggered by [OP]
  ▷ Special aspecual marking results from conditional allomorphy in the context of [OP]
- More broadly, this account shows that Baier’s analysis of anti-agreement as φ-impoverishment in the context of Ā-features is applicable to forms of morphological leveling in the context of Ā-movement
→ Leveling of voice/reality status distinctions in Caquinte
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