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1 Introduction

• This presentation has as its empirical focus the presence or absence of the verbal suffix -(a)k in Caquinte,1 a Kampa Arawak language of southeastern Peru2

• Studies of related languages have analyzed cognate suffixes as markers of aspect

  – Payne (1981) analyzes Ashéninka -ak as a perfect

  – Again for Ashéninka (Mihas 2015:214-216), and for Nanti (Michael 2008:255-256) and Matsigenka (Snell 2011:855), the analysis is of a perfective category

  – Dohn (2017) is the most in-depth analysis of this morpheme, and he also analyzes it as a perfective in Matsigenka, based largely on cancellation tests

• These authors typically point to the culminated nature of the eventualities denoted by the verbs marked with -k, and indeed alternations in culmination are frequent in Caquinte, as seen by comparing the generic interpretation of (1) with the culminated interpretation of (2)3

(1) “Jeeje, noshekati emooki...” GENERIC

---

*Data comes from a corpus of over 8,000 lines developed as part of ongoing fieldwork begun in 2011. I am indebted to Caquinte speakers Antonina Salazar Torres, Joy Salazar Torres, Emilia Sergio Salazar, and Miguel Sergio Salazar for their patience, generosity, and enthusiasm. This analysis benefited from conversations with Lev Michael, Nicholas Rolle, and especially Stephanie Farmer. Financial support came from two Oswalt Endangered Language grants at UC Berkeley (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.


2This suffix exhibits two allomorphs, -ak and -k, which are not discussed here. In what follows I refer to it as -k. (Note that this is pace Swift (1988), who analyzes these two suffixes as distinct morphemes.)

3I adopt ‘generic’ in place of ‘habitual’ to draw a similarity with Dohn’s (2017) analysis of bare verbs in Matsigenka. Abbreviations are: A = applicative; ABL = ablative; ACT = active; ALIEN = alienable; ALL = allative; AM = associated motion; CAUS = causative; CE = counter-expectational; COP = copula; D = demonstrative; DIR = directional; DUR = durative; EPST = epistemic; EVID = evidential; F = feminine; FOC = focus; IDEO = ideophone; INCNTR = incongruent; IND = individuating; INDIR = indirect; INSTR = instrumental; IRR = irrealis; LOC = locative; M = masculine; MAL = malefactive; ME = male ego; MED = medial; MID = middle; NEG = negation; NOMZ = nominalizer; NR = nonreferential; O = object; P = possessor; PL = plural; POSS = possessive; PRO = pro-form; PURP = purpose; R = realis; REC = recipient; RED = reduplicate; REG = regressive; REL = relativizer; S = subject; TOP = topic.
“Yes, I eat *emooki* grubs…” (ptk)

(Inkajaranki pitsekariki noshekataki osaiteberi…”

“I ate paca earlier, during the night…” (pik)

• Bare verbs, those lacking -k, may also receive progressive interpretations, a sort of non-culmination, as in (3), a response to the question *Taa opaji panti?* ‘What are you doing?’

(3) “Irogenti najakatsinotiri nochaajanikirite.”

“I am washing my children.” (caa)

• In fact the interpretation of bare verbs is fairly broad – in addition to generic and progressive interpretations, they may also be interpreted as culminated, as in (4)

(4) Ari ipitsokashitana ikantana...

Then he turned around and said to me… (gtk)

• More problematic, although relatively infrequent, are non-culminated eventualities denoted by verbs marked with -k (5a)

(5) CONTEXT: *Ikenapojuvi amashaijiave ikajemakotsitari, ikantirin* ‘He heard him singing and called out to him, saying:’

a. “*Taate pantake?*”

b. Iriatimpika ikaniti: “Tee, mana namashaiti…”

• Similarly, stative verbs are typically interpreted as non-culminated (6) when marked with -k
I’m sick, and I’m very sad, and my bones have begun to hurt a lot...

- Although the non-culmination of states in combination with perfectives seems to be a widely accepted crosslinguistic fact, I suggest that it should be taken as one piece of evidence against a perfective analysis of Caquinte -k

- In what follows, I argue that bare verbs are akin to generics and that -k individuates them

1.1 Basics of Caquinte Grammar

- Caquinte is polysynthetic, strongly head-marking, and largely agglutinative

- Obligatory verbal categories are subject agreement, reality status (Michael 2014), and voice

  - Subject agreement is prefixal with transitive predicates, but follows a fluid distribution with intransitive predicates, alternating between prefixal and suffixal sets (Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no-</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>-aji</td>
<td>-aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pi-</td>
<td>-mpi</td>
<td>-mpi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>o-</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Reality status is a distinction between notionally realized and unrealized eventualities (e.g., negated clauses, those with future temporal reference, counterfactuals, etc.)

  - Realis is exponed fusionally with voice via the suffixes -i (active) or -a (middle)
  - Irrealis is exponed uniquely via -e, with middle voice exponed separately via -mpa
  - An additional irrealis prefix n-, an assimilating placeless nasal

<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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Baier and O’Hagan (2018) for an analysis of the interaction of these categories.
• Other verbal categories include aspect, individuation (see below), direction, associated motion, distributivity, plurality actionality, participant number, and numerous adverbial categories, e.g., -aman ‘early in the morning’
  - There is no grammaticized encoding of tense, such temporal relations being inferrable in part based on reality status contrasts

• Other derivational categories include upwards of ten applicatives, three causatives, an antipassive, and a reciprocal

• A large set of second position clitics express higher-level categories such as modality, evidentiality, interclausal relations, etc.

• In the verbal domain, epenthesis of /t/ and /a/ repair vowel and consonant hiatus, respectively
  - Epenthesis feeds a process by which any morpheme-final /g/ deletes unless the following segment is a reality status suffix

• Sentences often consist of a single word, which may be quite large

  (7) ...kameetsanijite irojokajitabenerigeti kishokiro irishekatakaijapjempariniji.
  kameetsa =niji =te iri- ojok -ji -ab -k -e -nV -ri =geti
  PURP =PURP =CE 3M.S.IRR- give -NR -DIR -IND -IRR -A:REC -3M.O =when
  kishokiro iri- sheka -akag -jig -poj -e -mpa -ri =niji
  cooked.manioc 3M.S.IRR- eat -CAUS -PL -ALL -IRR -MID -3M.O =PURP
  ...so that when they give him cooked manioc they can make him eat it. (shm)

1.2 Theories of Aspect
• Klein (1994) establishes a theory of tense and aspect based on the work of Hans Reichenbach
  • His ontology includes:
    - Lexical content (LC): atemporal description of an eventuality
    - Utterance time (TU): moment of speaking ()
    - Topic time (TT): ‘time about which a claim is being made’ [] (Cleary-Kemp 2015:29)
    - Situation time (TSit): ‘time for which the situation described by the LC holds’ {} (ibid.)
  • Lexical content may consist of one state (e.g., be red) or two (e.g., die)
    - Source state (SS)
    - Target state (TS)
    - Schematization of one state: x x x x x x
    - Schematization of two states: ————+++++
    - In the case of lexical content with two states, a language lexicalizes only one in its temporal system (in English, SS)

5The first line of interlinearized examples reflects surface pronunciation (ignoring an optional process of /h/ metathesis). In the segmented portion of these examples I remove epenthetic segments and restore a deleted /g/.
**Aspect:** situates TT with respect to TSit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Diagram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>TT (partially) includes TSit</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect</td>
<td>TT is fully included in TSit</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>TT is after TSit</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective</td>
<td>TT is before TSit</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tense:** situates TT with respect to TU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Diagram</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>TT is before TU</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>TT includes TU</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>TT is after TU</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Diagram" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Grammatical or viewpoint aspect in the Kleinian sense goes on to interact with lexical aspect, or *Aktionsart*, which comes in a variety of types
- For present purposes we can distinguish five *Aktionsarten*, based on the properties dynamicity, punctuality, and telicity (i.e., whether an eventuality has a natural endpoint)

![Diagram](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

**Figure 2:** Types of Aktionsart (adapted from Dohn (2017:14), citing Smith (1997))
2 Imperfective Aspect

- The alternation between prefixal and suffixal subject agreement with intransitive verbs hinges on an aspecual distinction\(^6\)
  
  - The construction in which subject agreement is suffixal expresses imperfective aspect

- Imperfective aspect is not always obvious, as captured by the translations of alternating (8) & (9), where the latter is felicitously translated with the English perfect

(8) Arikea oteronkanaka isheka.

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{ari} \quad \text{=kea} \quad \text{oter} \quad \text{an} \quad \text{-k} \quad \text{-a} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{sheka} \\
\text{PRO} \quad \text{=EVID} \quad \text{3F.S} \quad \text{finish} \quad \text{-ABL} \quad \text{-IND} \quad \text{-R:MID} \quad \text{3M.P} \quad \text{food}
\end{array} \]

Then his food ran out. (ank)

(9) “Teronkanaka shekatsi.”

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{teronk} \quad \text{-an} \quad \text{-k} \quad \text{-a} \quad \text{-Ø} \quad \text{sheka} \quad \text{-tsi} \\
\text{finish} \quad \text{-ABL} \quad \text{-IND} \quad \text{-R:MID} \quad \text{3S} \quad \text{food} \quad \text{-ALIEN}
\end{array} \]

“The food has run out.” (ank)

- Spanish *ya* ‘already’ is frequently salient to speakers (10)

(10) “Abiro aanajerine, magopojana naatimpa.”

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{abiro} \quad \text{ag} \quad \text{-an} \quad \text{-aj} \quad \text{-e} \quad \text{-ri} \quad \text{-ne} \quad \text{mago} \quad \text{-poj} \quad \text{-a} \quad \text{-na} \quad \text{naatimpa} \\
\text{2:FOC} \quad \text{take} \quad \text{-ABL} \quad \text{-REG} \quad \text{-IRR} \quad \text{-3M.O} \quad \text{-IRR} \quad \text{be.tired} \quad \text{-ALL} \quad \text{-R:MID} \quad \text{1S} \quad \text{1:TOP}
\end{array} \]

“You take it, I’m already tired.” (kac)

- Yet in other instances this sense is lacking, as in (11) & (12)

(11) “Kityonkamentetsanobackempi...”

\[ \begin{array}{c}
kityonka \quad \text{-mentetsano} \quad \text{-bae} \quad \text{-k} \quad \text{-i} \quad \text{-mpi} \\
\text{be.dark.red} \quad \text{-neck} \quad \text{-DUR} \quad \text{-IND} \quad \text{-R:ACT} \quad \text{-2S}
\end{array} \]

“You’re really a dark red color in the neck...” (hag)

(12) “Jeee soake aapani!”

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{jeee} \quad \text{soq} \quad \text{-k} \quad \text{-i} \quad \text{-Ø} \quad \text{aapani} \\
\text{IDEO} \quad \text{choke} \quad \text{-IND} \quad \text{-R:ACT} \quad \text{-3S} \quad \text{father}
\end{array} \]

“Aaa, father is choking!” (not)

\(^6\)The distribution of prefixal and suffixal subject agreement in Kampa languages has been approached from a variety of perspectives. See O’Hagan (2015) for background.
Although it is infrequent in the corpus, verbs in this construction may be marked by as few categories as reality status and person (13)

(13) “Shineta iinani.”

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{shine} -a \quad \boxed{\text{-Ø}} \quad \text{iinani} \\
\text{be.happy} \ -\text{R:MIC} \ -3s \quad \text{mother}
\end{array}\]

“Mother’s in a good mood, as she usually is.” (not)

What these examples share is that topic time is contained within situation time

– The situation already holds at topic time and continues after it

– When the eventuality is a state (e.g., mago ‘be tired’), this is straightforward; when it is dynamic (e.g., teronk ‘finish’), the result state is relevant

– That topic time is contained within situation time in these sorts of examples becomes more apparent when the alternation in subject agreement is embedded under amen ‘see’, which serves as an explicit topic time independent of utterance time

– In (14), the moment of death is witnessed, whereas in (15) only the dead body is

(14) Irirakea Kamotsontopari yamenabakeri imetojajiake chaajanikiripae...

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{iri- ra} \quad =\text{kea} \quad \text{Kamotsontopari} \quad i- \quad \text{amen} -\text{ab} \quad -k \quad -i \quad -ri \quad \boxed{\text{i-}} \\
\text{3M- D:MED} \quad \text{=EVID} \quad \text{Kamotsontopari} \quad \text{3M.S- see} \quad -\text{DIR} \quad -\text{IND} \quad -\text{R:ACT} \quad -\text{3M.O} \quad \text{3M.S-}
\end{array}\]

\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{metoj -jig} \quad -k \quad -i \quad \text{chaajanikiri} \quad =\text{pae} \\
\text{die} \quad -\text{PL} \quad -\text{IND} \quad -\text{R:ACT} \quad \text{child} \quad =\text{PL}
\end{array}\]

Kamotsontopari watched the children die... (ttk)

(15) ...yamenajiapojiri metojake Kishaiba.

\[\begin{array}{l}
i- \quad \text{amen} -\text{jig} -\text{poj} \quad -i \quad -\text{ri} \quad \text{metoj} \quad -\text{k} \quad -i \quad \boxed{\text{-Ø}} \quad \text{Kishaiba} \\
\text{3M.S- see} \quad -\text{PL} \quad -\text{ALL} \quad -\text{R:ACT} \quad -\text{3M.O} \quad \text{die} \quad -\text{IND} \quad -\text{R:ACT} \quad -3s \quad \text{Kishaiba}
\end{array}\]

...when they got there they saw that Kishaiba was dead. (ttk)

– The fact that the imperfective tracks on the result state of metoj ‘die’ is evidence that, with two-state predicates, Caquinte lexicalizes Klein’s target state (TS), not source state (SS)\(^7\)

– Schematization of (15): \[---\{++++[++++]+++\}\]

– Lastly, a transitive verb with an overt nominal object may occur in this construction so long as it lacks object agreement (i.e., has an indefinite object), as in (16)

(16) ...yamenajiapojakerei omporogijajiaka mirajiaka kachojari...

\[\begin{array}{l}
i- \quad \text{amen} -\text{ojakerei} -\text{poj} \quad -i \quad -\text{ri} \quad \text{metoj} \quad -\text{k} \quad -i \quad \boxed{\text{-Ø}} \quad \text{Kishaiba} \\
\text{3M.S- see} \quad -\text{PL} \quad -\text{ALL} \quad -\text{R:ACT} \quad -\text{3M.O} \quad \text{die} \quad -\text{IND} \quad -\text{R:ACT} \quad -3s \quad \text{Kishaiba}
\end{array}\]

\(^7\)Otherwise (15) would mean that Kishaiba was seen dying, but not actually dead.
...they saw them milling about drinking manioc beer... (kch2)

• Crucially, -k occurs in this imperfective construction, so it cannot also be a perfective

3 Bare Verbs and Individuating -k

• We have seen that verbs lacking an object suffix have a dedicated imperfective construction available to them consisting of suffixal subject agreement

• In what follows, I assume that the prefixal subject construction carries no inherent aspectual value, but is a default either when imperfective is not explicitly encoded or when the verb requires an object suffix for independent reasons

• Similarly, given that we have seen that bare verbs can have generic, progressive, and culminating interpretations, I assume that they too have no inherent aspectual value
  – Thus a bare verb with prefixal subject agreement is fully atemporal, with only its reality status indicating whether the eventuality that it denotes has been realized

• Nevertheless, bare verbs are compatible with past (17) and future (18) contexts, here with a generic interpretation

  (17) Koramani itsabetanjitiri kakintejia ikanka.  BARE, PAST
  koramani i- tsabetaN -ji -i -ri kakinte -jia i- kan -k -a
  3M.S- 3M.S- tell.story -NR -R:ACT -3M.O person -PL 3M.S- COP -IND -R:MID

  Long ago they used to tell stories about them that they were people. (hag)

  (18) ...irisookiteri tetaka kakinte.  BARE, FUTURE
  iri- sooki -e -ri te -ak -a kakinte
  3M.S.IRR- see -IRR -3M.O contain -IND -R:MID person

  ...he will see that there are people contained inside. (kat)

• Bare verbs are also found in all clause types, e.g., relative clauses9 (19) and temporal subordinate clauses (20), here again with generic interpretations

  (19) Mana pimpeakempa amiririka igonoro...  BARE, RELATIVE
  mana pi- N- peg -k -e -mpa ami -i -ri =ka i- gonoro
  instead 2S- IRR- become -IND -IRR -MID help -R:ACT -3M.O =REL 3M.P- fellow

  Instead become someone who helps their fellow Caquintes... (gtk)

8That is, the moon, as he regularly traps the spirits of the dead in his celestial fish trap.

9Note that extraction suppresses corresponding agreement on the verb – see Baier and O’Hagan (2018).
He was just like him when he spoke and when he laughed. (ama)

- Culminated interpretations of bare verbs are especially common as the last of a chain of verbs that are otherwise all marked with -k, as in (21)

\[(21) \text{Arikea ishiashipojakena itatsinkapojakena nojokabeta isabiji porokiren.}\]

Then he ran up to me and pushed me down and I fell onto the rocks coming close to the ground. (gtk)

- In contrast, we have seen that verbs marked with -k can be interpreted as progressive (5a) and culminated, and that they may appear in the imperfective

  - They are also frequently interpreted as non-culminated with statives, as in (22)

\[(22) \text{“Imaika noninke nompeakempi nomankigare.”}\]

“Now I want to treat you as my wife.”

- This is irrespective of reality status, -k being compatible with both realis and irrealis (23)

\[(23) \text{“Imaika inkameetsabaekte nochaajnikirite, irabisanakeri ashi chonchokoronti.”}\]

“Now my children will be very beautiful, more than the deer’s.” (caa)

• In other words, although -k seems to exhibit the properties of a perfective in many instances, it cannot be analyzed as such in all instances

• In light of this, I argue that -k individuates eventualities as discrete, bounded units, but does not relate those individuated eventualities to other ones, as would tense and/or aspect
• On this analysis, bare verbs are generic because no discrete instantiation of a particular eventuality is referred to

• Verbs marked with -k frequently yield culminated interpretations by inference from the simple fact that they are explicitly bounded in such constructions

• Of special interest, then, are the progressive and culminated interpretations of bare verbs and the progressive interpretations of verbs marked with -k
  – Progressives are frequently bare because the context is rich enough that individuation is not required (see below); however, they may be marked with -k since the atemporal operation of individuation is compatible with their ongoingness at topic time
  – Bare verbs may receive culminated interpretations because they are underspecified as to their boundedness
  – Verbs marked with -k are expected to never be interpreted generically, as is borne out

• There are then conventions in discourse regarding when eventualities are individuated
  – Eventualities in a sequence will frequently be individuated in order to clarify that one occurred after another
  – Individuated eventualities are associated with the primary narrative line
  – Unindividuated eventualities are associated with secondary narrative lines

• Importantly, the frequent non-culmination of stative eventualities is expected
  – They are perhaps more likely to be individuated because their bare forms would be interpreted as generics
  – The latter is because, as statives, they do not have a progressive interpretation at their disposal, another common interpretation of bare verbs that denote dynamic eventualities

3.1 Irrealis and -k

• Declarative clauses with future temporal reference and imperative clauses are identical
  – Imperatives consist of an irrealis verb with a second person subject, and are vague regarding declarative and imperative interpretations

• Speakers often have the intuition that ‘bare imperatives’ (i.e., those lacking -k) are interpreted as expected to be followed sooner

• This distinction is largely born out in texts, where a temporally more proximal eventuality will be expressed with a bare verb and the more distal one with -k (24)

  (24) “...pantaitapoje kameetsanijite pishekatakempa abiatimpa.”
  
  pi- N- atai -apoj -e kameetsa =niji =te pi- sheka -ak -e -mpa abiatimpa
  2S- IRR- climb -ALL -IRR PURP =PURP =CE 2S- eat -IND -IRR -MID 2:TOP
  “...climb up here so you can eat.” (hag)

• This is consistent with the frequent progressive interpretations of bare verbs, i.e., they seem to be more closely associated with the time of utterance than those marked with -k
4 Combining -k with Other Morphemes

4.1 Morphemes Incompatible with -k

- The regressive directional -aj cannot combine with -k

(25) Nokoraketaji...yamajana notinerijaniki Marishiari.

no- korake [aj -i i- am [aj -a -na no- tenerijaniki Marishiari
1S- come -REG -R:ACT 3M.S- bring -REG -R:MID -1O 1P- cross.nephew Marcial

I came back here, my nephew Marcial brought me. (tsh)

- It also seems to individuate eventualities in the same way as -k, with an additional directional component, as pointed out for related Matsigenka (Dohn 2017)

4.2 Morphemes that Require Individuation

- Two verbal suffixes, the directionals -an and -ab, must be followed by either -k or -aj
  - The ablative directional -an encodes motion away
  - The directional -ab often encodes motion of the subject toward the object

(26) Yaranake jeontaaa, yagatanake inchatoki, ibetsatanaka...

i- ar [an [-k -i jeontaaa i- aga [an [-k -i inchato =ki
3M.S- fly -ABL -IND -R:ACT IDEO 3M.S- perch -ABL -IND -R:ACT tree =LOC
i- obetsa [an [-k -a
3M.S- speak -ABL -IND -R:MID

He flew away jeontaaa, perched on a tree, and spoke... (pam)

(27) Ikantsitabakari, ikoakotabakeri...

i- kan -itsi [ab [-k -a -ri i- koako [ab [-k -i -ri

He said to him, he asked him... (kon)

(28) “Arika nomontsajabajempari anianishi...”

ari =ka no- omontsaj [ab [-aj -e -mpa -ri anianishi
PRO =EPIST 1S- encounter -DIR -REG -IRR -MID -3M.O brother-in-law

“Maybe I will run into my brother-in-law again...” (vam)

(29) Arikea opitsekajigeti oanaji otekokitgeti.

ari =kea o- pitsek [an [-aj -i =geti 0- og [an [-aj -i
PRO =EVID 3F.S- be.night -ABL -REG -R:ACT =when 3F.S- go -ABL -REG -R:ACT
o- teoki -i =geti
3F.S- sleep -R:ACT =where

Then when night fell she went back to where she slept. (kat)

- Whether these collocations always involve individuation awaits further research
4.3 Negation and -k

- The regressive -aj occurs under negation (30)

(30) Arikea tee iramanajeriji ashinkaroka kitsaarentsi.

ari =kea [tee iri- aman -aj -e -ri -ji] ashiN -k -a
PRO =EVID NEG:R 3M.S.IRR ask.for -REG -IRR -3M.O -NEG:R own -IND -R:MID
-ro =ka kitsaa -re -ntsi
-3F.O =REL dress -NOMZ -ALIEN

Afterwards he didn’t ask the person who owned the clothes for them back. (okp)

- Individuating -k only occurs under negation in combination with -an (31) or -ab (32)

(31) “Teempate ontaseanakeji?”


“Doesn’t she get hungry?” (kam)

(32) ...tee irinejakotabakempaji arejebaetaka ontaniki...

-Ø ontaniki
-3S over.there

...he didn’t see that he had arrived over there... (kap)

- Otherwise, it deletes (33)

(33) Tee nontineokiteji, notineokike sotsiki.

[tee no- N- timeoki -e -ji] no- timeoki -k -i sotsiki NEG:R 1s- IRR- sleep -IRR -NEG:R 1s- sleep -IND -R:ACT outside

I didn’t sleep, I slept outside. (gtk)

5 Conclusion

- I have proposed that Caquinte -k individuates eventualities such that problematic instances of a perfective are done away with

  - Bare verbs, in contrast, denote generic eventualities

- Bare verbs may receive generic, progressive, and culminated interpretations

- Verbs marked with -k may receive progressive and culminated interpretations with dynamic eventualities, as well as non-progressive, non-culminated interpretations with stative ones
Analyzing -\(k\) as something other than a perfective also accounts for its appearance in the imperfective construction expressed via suffixal subject agreement

- This analysis must be combined with a theory of when bare verbs (generic eventualities) are permissible in actual usage

As a result, I argue that Caquinte exhibits only one aspectual construction in a Kleinian sense, the imperfective.

The present analysis differs from that in Dohn (2017) for related Matsigenka, in which:

1. cognate -\(ak\) is analyzed as a perfective
2. the sequence -\(an-ak\) is analyzed as a progressive
3. regressive -\(aj\) is substituted for -\(ak\) in the sequence -\(an-aj\) in order to express perfective aspect (i.e., and not progressive or regressive)
4. a zero morpheme -\(Ø\) is posited to express a ‘generic imperfective’

As concerns these points from the perspective of Caquinte:

1. Many of the non-culminated interpretations of verbs marked with -\(k\) were found only in examining naturalistic data
2. There are numerous non-progressive, non-directional interpretations of the sequence -\(an-k\) that warrant further investigation in comparison with Matsigenka
3. The regressive seems to always add a directional (or metaphorically extended) meaning to the stem to which it attaches, unlike Matsigenka
4. Bare verbs have been shown to exhibit more than generic interpretations, calling into doubt a zero morpheme -\(Ø\) that expresses this meaning

For languages in which a perfective seems to “misbehave” in various ways (including with statives), how often is this because it may not be a perfective in the strict sense adopted here?
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