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1 Introduction

Kampan is a branch of Arawak languages spoken in lowland southeastern Peru (Figure 1)

• Arawak is the geographically most widespread family of South America, reaching from the Antilles to extreme southern Amazonia

Kampan is commonly understood to consist of six languages (Figure 2)

• Ashéninka dialects: Perené, Pichis, Ucayali, Apurucayali, Pajonal

• Matsigenka dialects: Lower Urubamba, Upper Urubamba, Manú

• Nomatsigenka, Nanti, Asháninka, and Caquinte are relatively homogeneous dialectally

This presentation investigates grammatical change in this family in the domain of main clause negation — or ‘standard negation’ (Miestamo 2005) — and prohibits

I reconstruct the system of standard negation and prohibitive in Proto-Kampan (PK)

Roadmap: §2 reality status; §3 negation and prohibitive; §4 diachrony; §5 conclusions

*I am grateful for helpful comments on an earlier version of this presentation from participants at *dhvorom, a Berkeley historical linguistics working group. Caquinte data comes from my fieldwork in the community of Kitepámani. There I thank speakers Antonina Salazar Torres, Joy Salazar Torres, Emilia Sergio Salazar, and Miguel Sergio Salazar. In the examples that follow, I occasionally modify the segmentation and glossing of original sources to facilitate comparability in the examples.

†Abbreviations: 1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; ADV = adverbial; AM = associated motion; ANTIP = antipassive; APPL = applicative; APPR = apprehensive; DUR = durative; EP = epenthetic; F = feminine; FOC = focus; FRUST = frustrative; IDEO = ideophone; INCL = inclusive; INDR = indirect; INTR = intransitive; IRR = irrealis; M = masculine; NEG = negation; O = object; PERF = perfective; P = possessor; POSS = possessive; PRO = pronoun; PROG = progressive; PROH = prohibitive; REAL = realis; RECIP = reciprocal; REG = regressive; REL = relativizer; REV = reversative; S = subject; SE = subject extraction.
2 Reality Status

All Kampan languages exhibit an obligatory verbal inflectional category (suffix) that distinguishes realis and irrealis clauses\(^\text{1}\).

‘Reality status’ distinguishes notionally realized and unrealized eventualities \((\text{Michael} \ 2014\text{c})\):

- **REALIS**: past or present temporal reference
- **IRREALIS**: future temporal reference, negation, counterfactuals, imperatives

Two reality status classes are present in every language (Table \(\text{1}\)\(^\text{2}\)).

\(^1\)With verbs whose initial segment is a stop or affricate, irrealis is multiply exponed via a prefix \(*\text{N}-\), a placeless nasal; with verbs beginning with any other segment whose subject is third-person masculine, irrealis is multiply exponed via an irregular form of the third-person masculine agreement prefix \(*\text{ir(i)-}\).

\(^2\)Often verbs may change class to yield active (i-class) and middle (a-class) readings.
3 Standard Negation and Prohibitives

All Kampan languages exhibit two distinct clause-initial negative particles that differ in the reality status value of their complement.

1. Negates notionally realis eventuality, with verb morphologically irrealis (2a)

2. Negates notionally irrealis eventuality, resulting in ‘double irreality’ with verb morphologically realis (2b)
(2) **Matsigenka**

a. Tera iriate.

\[
\text{tera } \text{iri- } a \ -t \ -e \\
\text{NEG } 3\text{M.S.IRR- go -EP -IRR.I}
\]

‘He didn’t go.’

b. Gara iati.

\[
\text{gara } i- \ a \ -t \ -i \\
\text{NEG } 3\text{M.S- go -EP -REAL.I}
\]

‘He won’t go.’ (Snell 2011:838)

In some languages, the standard negators are further differentiated from a prohibitive (3)

(3) **Tambo Asháninka**

a. Tee nomaayehi.

\[
\text{tee } \text{no- } \text{maay -e } =\text{hi} \\
\text{NEG 1S- sleep -IRR.I =NEG}
\]

‘I didn’t go to sleep.’ (Kindberg 1961:514)

b. ...eiro otimi iseto.

\[
\text{eiro } o- \text{ tim -i } i- \text{ seito} \\
\text{NEG 3F.S- live -REAL.I 3M.P- gizzard}
\]

‘...now his gizzard won’t live.’ (Kindberg 1961:514)

c. Ato pikamantiri.

\[
\text{ato } \text{pi- } \text{kamaNt -i } =\text{ri} \\
\text{PROH 2S- tell -REAL.I =3M.O}
\]

‘Don’t you tell him.’ (Kindberg 1961:516)

In other languages, the negator of irrealis eventualities is identical to the prohibitive (4)

(4) **Caquinte**

a. Tee ameneri ahitsi.

\[
\text{tee } o- \text{ amen -e } =\text{ri } =\text{hi ahitsi} \\
\text{NEG 3F.S- see -IRR.I =3M.O =NEG jaguar}
\]

‘She didn’t see the jaguar.’ (caa42)

b. Aato nomankigata.

\[
\text{aato } \text{no- } \text{mankiga -t } -a \\
\text{NEG 1S- marry -EP -REAL.A}
\]

‘I won’t marry.’ (kam88)

c. Aato pikoraketahi.

\[
\text{aato } \text{pi- } \text{korake -t } -ah \ -i \\
\text{PROH 2S- come -EP -REG -REAL.I}
\]

‘Don’t come back.’ (okp356)
Table 2: Standard Negation and Prohibitives in Kampan Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>V=hi</td>
<td>te(ra)</td>
<td>te(ra)</td>
<td>*te</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>kero</td>
<td>airo</td>
<td>V(=tsi)</td>
<td>eiro V(=chi)</td>
<td>aato</td>
<td>ga(ra)</td>
<td>ha(ra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROH</td>
<td>kero</td>
<td>(airo) V(=tsi)</td>
<td>V(=tsi) aato V(=tsi)</td>
<td>V(=tsi) ga(ra)</td>
<td>ha(ra)</td>
<td>*(kairo) V=tsi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant observations (Table 2):

- Tambo Asháninka and Caquinte exhibit additional clitic =hi required in negation of realis eventualities
- Only Tambo Asháninka fully distinguishes standard negators and prohibitive
- In Nomatsigenka, Caquinte, Matsigenka, and Nanti, the negator of negative eventualities and the prohibitive are identical (i.e., within each of those languages)
- Matsigenka and Nanti exhibit unique negator/prohibitive resembling gara
- Tambo Asháninka and Caquinte exhibit unique prohibitive resembling ato
  - In Caquinte this form is also the negator of irrealis eventualities
- Perené Ashéninka prohibitives may be formed with either the preverbal particle, the clitic, or both (see below)

The bound forms -tsi and =chi co-occur optionally with the negator of irrealis eventualities and the prohibitive in Perené Ashéninka and Tambo Asháninka, respectively.

(5) **PERENÉ ASHÉNINKA**

a. Airo oshitovitatzi...
   - **NEG**
   - **airo o- shito -vi -t -atz -i**
   - ‘She won’t leave...’ [Mihas 2015:520]

b. Airo aminantzitsi.
   - **NEG**
   - **airo o- amin -aNT -i -tsi**
   - NEG 3F.S- look -ANTIP -REAL.I -?
   - ‘She will not look (at people)...’ [Mihas 2015:533]

c. Airo pishiritaro pihathe katonko...
   - **PROH**
airo pi- shiri -t -a =ro pi- ha -t -e katonko
‘Don’t think about going upstream...’ (Mihas 2015:520)

d. ...airo pikisavakatsi.
airo pi- kis -avak -a -tsi
PROH 2S- be.angry -RECIP -REAL.A -?
‘...don’t get angry with each other.’ (Mihas 2015:533)

(6) TAMBO ASHÁNINKA
a. Eiro nokoshitinpi.
   eiro no- koshi -t -i =Npi
   NEG 1S- steal -EP -REAL.1 =2O
   ‘I won’t steal from you.’ (Kindberg 1961:515)

b. Eiro noneahirichi.
eiro no- ne -ah -i =ri =chi
NEG 1S- see -REG -REAL.1 =3M.O =?
‘I won’t see him [again].’ (ibid.)

c. Atoya pikamantiri piri.
   ato =ya pi- kamaNt -i =ri pi - iri
   PROH =? 2S- tell -REAL.1 =3M.O 2P- father
   ‘Don’t tell your father.’ (Kindberg 1961:516)

d. Ato pichotokirochi...
   ato pi- chotok -i =ro =chi
   PROH 2S- pinch -REAL.1 =3F.O =?
   ‘Don’t pinch her...’ (ibid.)

Similar, Caquinte =tsi optionally co-occurs with the prohibitive aato (7), but, unlike Perené Ashéninka and Tambo Asháninka, not with the negator of irrealis eventualities

(7) Aato poishorehakotiritsi.

   aato pi- oisho -reh -ako -t -i =ri =tsi
   PROH 2S- tie -REV -APPL:INDR -EP -REAL.1 =3M.O =?
   ‘Don’t untie him.’ (kon92)

In addition, Perené Ashéninka -tsi may appear alone, functioning as a prohibitive

- Note that -tsi, like gara in (2b) and ato in (3c), yields morphological realis on the verb

(8) Pikinavaitzitsi.

   pi- kin -a -vai -t -i =tsi
‘Stay inside [lit. Don’t go out]!’ (Mihas 2015:533-534)

Caquinte = tsi may also appear alone, but it functions not as a prohibitive and instead as an apprehensive (Vuillermet submitted).

(9) Aashia yaapanahantinpitsi.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aashia} & \quad \text{i-ag} & \quad \text{-apanahaN} & \quad -t & \quad -i & \quad =\text{Npi} & \quad =\text{tsi} \\
\text{IDEO} & \quad \text{3M.S- take} & \quad \text{-AM} & \quad \text{-EP} & \quad \text{-REAL.I} & \quad =\text{2O} & \quad =\text{APPR}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Watch out he’ll take you!’ (shm219)

4 Diachrony

Cognates to -tsi, =chi, and =tsi are absent in Nomatsigenka, Matsigenka, and Nanti

- Thus it is either an innovation in PAAC or a retention in its daughter languages

Their interaction with a standard negation particle resembles a Jespersen cycle (Dahl 1979)

- A free form has come to reinforce a more archaic, morphologically bound form

Some reasoning:

- If *kairo reconstructs to PK (see Nomatsigenka) but *=tsi only to PAAC, then the latter would be analyzed as the reinforcer (i.e., the historically “younger” form)

- But the boundedness of *=tsi and its morphological position make it look like an archaic form of negation that predates the use of clause-initial particles (cf. *te)

- If that is so, then *=tsi must predate *kairo and thus reconstruct at least to PK

Partial proposal for reconstruction and diversification (see also Table2):

- PK *te negated reals eventualities (retained in every daughter language)

- PK *=tsi negated irrealis eventualities and functioned as a prohibitive, with optional reinforcement with *kairo

1. * V =tsi
2. *kairo V =tsi

- In Nomatsigenka, a reflex of *kairo became obligatory, and the reflex of *=tsi was lost

3. *kairo V

---

5 Other languages including Perené Ashéninka and Matsigenka exhibit a diachronically unrelated apprehensive =kari, which probably reconstructs with the same function to Proto-Kampan.

6 *kairo > Nomatsigenka kero; *kairo > PAAC *airo (cf. sporadic loss of word-initial *k); *airo > eiro etc. in some Ashéninka and Asháninka varieties. *kairo and *gara are not etymologically related.

7 PMN subsequently formed *tera from *te on analogy with *gara (Michael 2014b:196-197).
• In PMN, *kairo was replaced by *gara, and the reflex of *–tsi was similarly lost

It is less clear how *ato came to have the functions it does in Tambo Asháninka and Caquinte

1. Tambo Asháninka and Caquinte are not traditionally understood to form a clade, so positing *ato as a shared replacement of *kairo in these two languages, although perhaps initially the most natural explanation, is problematic

2. Relatedly, *ato cannot have replaced *kairo at PAAC without all Ashéninka and Asháninka varieties subsequently reborrowing a reflex of *kairo

3. Positing *ato as a replacement of *kairo only in the prohibitive construction in Tambo Asháninka would require stating that this form was borrowed into Caquinte and subsequently extended to negate irrealis eventualities, a less likely direction of change

I posit that *ato replaced *kairo only in Caquinte

• Tambo Asháninka borrowed the Caquinte prohibitive construction only (see Table 2)
• Caquinte *=tsi survived in two constructions:
  1. Independently as an apprehensive, replacing *=kari (see footnote)
  2. In conjunction with a reflex of *ato in a prohibitive construction

More generally, the varied optionality of *=tsi in standard negation and prohibitive constructions in PAAC daughter languages merely reflects differential degrees of loss due to reinforcement from a diachronically younger particle

Figure 3: Change in Standard Negation and Prohibitive

8Similarly, Perené Ashéninka *=tsi was retained only as a marginal prohibitive (see [8]).
5 Conclusions

Proto-Kampan is reconstructed as lacking a morphosyntactic distinction between one standard negation construction and a prohibitive

• *te negated realis eventualities
• *=tsi, with optional reinforcement from *kairo, negated irrealis eventualities

The retention of *=tsi in PAAC is crucial to understanding standard negation in PK

The distinction within standard negation is stable within Kampan, although the forms that express the negation of irrealis eventualities may have changed in a given language

Tambo Asháninka has innovated a morphosyntactically distinct category of prohibitive

Were both sorts of standard negation in Pre-PK expressed as verbal enclitics?

• The similar syntactic distribution of *te and *kairo suggests so (i.e., both may be due to Jespersen cycles)
• The presence of verbal enclitic =hi alongside reflexes of *te in Tambo Asháninka and Caquinte might serve as possible evidence for such a proposal
• However, if it is right that Caquinte aato was borrowed into Tambo Asháninka via its prohibitive construction, then =hi may equally plausibly have been borrowed

No sources for *kairo or *ato have been located (e.g., among words denoting small quantities)

• In Kampan languages, however, standard negators also function as response forms 'no'
• This suggests that they may originally only have had this function
• No cognates to these forms yet located in non-Kampan Arawak languages

Wide variation in the structural realization and form of negation in Arawak (Michael 2014a)

• No cognates to archaic *=tsi yet located in non-Kampan Arawak languages
• That the negation of irrealis eventualities was realized with =tsi in Pre-PK (and not just clause-initial particles) gives clues as to what sort of cognates to look for
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