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1 Introduction

This paper describes the morphosyntax and semantics of psych-predicates in Caquinte, a Kampan Arawak language of southeastern Peru with some 300 to 400 speakers. I define ‘psych-predicate’ broadly, and include verb roots that denote states of knowledge, belief, desire, and affect, a collocation that I will refer to atheoretically as ‘internal states’. The aim of this description is to ground future research into the morphosyntax, semantics, and interactional use of a series of second-position clitics that also make reference to internal states, although not those described here. The data on which this paper is based is drawn from a corpus of more than 5,000 lines of interlinearized text produced by four native speakers of Caquinte, as well as from conversations with Caquintes. The majority of texts – rich in quoted dialogue – are written narrative, and a minority are oral narrative that were transcribed by me in consultation with native speakers; all were translated into Spanish by Miguel Sergio Salazar.

1 These include, for example, differential epistemic states among interactants (e.g., see Hyslop (2014); contributions in San Roque and Bergqvist (2015)). The internality of these states demands research into a Caquinte theory of mind, which is outside the scope of this work. However, that research will include these linguistic structures.

2 Translation of any sort is a non-trivial task (see Hanks (2014)), but it is especially acute in the case of Caquinte. No speaker of Caquinte is a native speaker of Spanish, many Caquintes are in practice monolingual or bilingual in Caquinte and Matsigenka (Kampan, Arawak), and most of those who do speak Spanish use it on an irregular basis. As a result, translations of Caquinte into Spanish are largely a negotiation involving myself and my consultants. For the purposes of this paper I have additionally translated from Spanish into English. In doing so I have relied, given

Abbreviations: 1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; abl = ablative; add = additive; advblzr = adverbializer; alien = alienable; all = allative; antip = antipassive; ap = alienable possession; am = associated motion; apl = applicative; aug = augmentative; caus = causative; cl = classifier; commit = commitment; cngr = congruent; conj = conjectural; cntr = contrast; cop = copula; dec = deceased; dem = demonstrative; dir = directional; dist = distal; distr = distributive; epc = epenthetic consonant; epv = epenthetic vowel; evid = evidential; ext = existential; extrm = extremal; f = feminine; fe = feminine ego; frust = frustrating; hort = hortative; ideo = ideophone; imp = imperative; incl = inclusive; incongr = incongruent; indr = indirect; instr = instrumental; interr = interrogative; intj = interjection; intr = intransitive; irr = irrealis; loc = locative; mal = malefactive; m = masculine; med = medial; mon = monitive; neg = negation; ni = noun incorporation; nomz = nominalizer; nref = nonreferential; o = object; p = possessive; pl = plural; plract = pluractional; pos = positive; pres = presentative; pro = pronoun; purp = purpose; real = realis;reas = reason; rec = recipient; recip = reciprocal; redup = reduplication; reg = regressive; rel = relativizer; restr = restrictive; sub = subordinator; s = subject; sc = scene change; se = subject extraction; ss = same stance; ts = temporal specificity; trns = transitive; xxx = [unanalyzed]; wh = wh-word.
The syntactic study of psych-predicates since Belletti and Rizzi (1988) has focused on their valence and the thematic roles of their arguments, although the study of these predicates in these terms predates this period. This tradition continues to the present day (Cheung and Larson 2015), and research on lesser studied languages largely fits into it (e.g., Kim (2013)). The semantic study of psych-predicates, in contrast, is often manifest only through the glosses of the verbs that appear in the papers in this tradition, and such glosses are often relatively uninformative (e.g., ‘hate’). This paper attempts to fill this lacuna, and is especially concerned with describing the nature of the internal states denoted by these predicates in Caquinte, i.e., in “uncovering” shades of meaning via the rich exemplification of textual data as a way, in part, of illustrating how Caquintes talk about internal states. Although I will employ convenient glosses as a shorthand in interlinearization, the result is an attempt at a balance between morphosyntactic description in the traditional vein and lexical semantic description. Where possible I describe the interactional use of these predicates given my current understanding of Caquinte social norms and ways of speaking (Beier 2010).

In terms of their morphosyntax, Caquinte psych-predicates are verbs that, with one exception, may take a full range of derivational and inflectional morphology. They may select for nominal complements, finite clausal complements that may themselves also take a full range of derivational and inflectional morphology, or both. In what follows I describe, where relevant, the basic argument structure and thematic roles of these predicates, properties of clausal complements (e.g., coreference), and alternations involving directionals and valence-altering morphology. In addition, I more opportunistically describe morphosyntactic properties that pertain only to certain verbs (e.g., tendencies for frustrative morphology to surface on a complement).

The remainder of this section provides a brief overview of the grammatical profile of Caquinte so that the examples are as transparent as possible. Following that, the remainder of the paper is organized principally around how I have chosen to schematize the internal states denoted by Caquinte psych-predicates. This includes categories of cognition (§2), desire (§3), positive affect (§4), and negative affect (§5). I begin to describe direct quotation as a mode for the communication of internal states and the expression of commitments in (§6), and in §7 I summarize and conclude.

1.1 Basic Grammatical Profile

Caquinte is a strongly head-marking, agglutinative, polysynthetic language. The verbal word may be divided into four domains: a prefixing domain, a suffixing domain, and two enclitic domains. The prefixing domain is characterized by the deletion of vowels as a resolution of vowel hiatus; the suffix domain is characterized by a combination of the epenthesis of [t] and [a] as a resolution of vowel and consonant hiatus, respectively (n.b., vowel deletion is also attested in this domain); the two enclitic domains are defined prosodically as well as by a lack of epenthesis, with the inner domain exhibiting forms that always attach to the verb stem and the outer domain exhibiting forms with second-position behavior.

\[\text{\text{my own speaking abilities in Caquinte, on my understanding of the pragmatic force of the utterances in question in order to arrive at a translation that is as semantically and pragmatically balanced relative to the Caquinte as possible. This often requires significant departures in syntactic structure (e.g., word order), but it is my contention that in light of the research questions developed here this is the most faithful representation possible.} \]

\[\text{\text{Three other phonological processes are worthy of mention at this juncture. 1) morpheme-final /g/ is deleted in the domain spanning the right edge of the verb root and the suffix slot immediately to the left of the reality status suffixes. That is, morpheme-final /g/ only surfaces when it is immediately followed by a reality status suffix. 2) /h/ in the suffixal and inner enclitic domain deletes if doing so would result either in a long vowel or in a diphthong of falling sonority. 3) /h/ metathesizes to avoid onsetless syllables if doing so would result in the formation of either a long vowel or a diphthong of falling sonority and not in two adjacent /h/-initial syllables. (There is at least one exception to the ban on adjacent /h/-initial syllables that is not discussed here.) Epenthesis precedes the processes described here, e.g., /i-sotog-ha-ah-i/ → [i-soto,ha:tahi], /-akag-hig-ah-i/ → [a,kchi’ahi]. Also see [1].} \]
Obligatory verbal categories include the person of the subject (the leftmost affixal slot) and reality status (the rightmost affixal slot)\(^4\). The subjects of transitive verbs are crossreferenced via a set of prefixes, and the objects of transitive verbs are crossreferenced via a set of enclitics when the referent is information-structurally given, and as such may or may not co-occur with a nominal object. The subjects of intransitive verbs show two crossreferencing patterns: when the stem exhibits no aspectual value they are crossreferenced via the same prefixes as transitive subjects; when the stem exhibits an imperfective aspectual value, they are crossreferenced via the enclitics that correspond to transitive objects, with the exception that there is no crossreferencing when the intransitive subject is third person (O’Hagan 2015b). Verbal person markers are given in Table 1.

Table 1: Verbal Person Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A, (S_{ASP=0})</th>
<th>(S_{ASP=IMPF})</th>
<th>(P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n(o)-</td>
<td>=na</td>
<td>=na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>a-</td>
<td>=ahi</td>
<td>=ahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>p(i)-</td>
<td>=Npi</td>
<td>=Npi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>i-, ir(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 (Michael 2014). Caquinte, like all Kampan languages, exhibits two sets of reality status suffixes with two values each, realis and irrealis (Table 2).

Table 2: Reality Status Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(i)-Class</th>
<th>(a)-Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REALIS</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREALIS</td>
<td>-e</td>
<td>-eNpa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The \(i\)-class markers can generally be thought of as associating with active stems, while the \(a\)-class markers can generally be thought of as associating with middle stems (e.g., reflexives, reciprocals, verbs of consumption, etc.). As such, alternations involving one and the same verb root are common, and, in addition, certain verbal suffixes (e.g., the instrumental applicative -\(aNt\)) condition \(a\)-class obligatorily (no morpheme conditions \(i\)-class), and combinations of certain reality status suffixes with certain person enclitics are illicit.\(^6\)

Other verbal categories include temporal non-specificity (see Cleary-Kemp 2014), direction, associated motion, distributivity, pluractionality, participant number, and numerous adverbial-like categories, e.g., -\(aman\), which expresses that the eventuality denoted by the verb root occurred early

\(^4\)However, even marking of the subject and reality status may be suppressed under certain conditions, the former in instances of extraction (e.g., \(wh\)-questions) and the latter when followed by the first person inclusive enclitic =\(ahi\).

\(^5\)Parentheses indicate vowels that delete before vowel-initial roots. (First person inclusive \(a\)- exceptionally deletes before the vowel-initial root \(ag\) ‘go’ in order to avoid homophony with \(ag\) ‘fetch’. In all other instances the initial vowel of the root deletes.) Third person masculine \(i\)- glides before vowel-initial roots.

\(^6\)In the examples that follow I represent conditioned reality status class alternations and resolutions of illicit reality status-person combinations in the orthographic representation in the initial line. In the line of segmentation I provide the underlying form of reality status suffixes illicit on the surface, but preserve conditioned alternations.
in the morning. Valence-altering categories marked on the verb include twelve applicatives, three causatives, an antipassive, and a reciprocal. The number of applicatives is noteworthy: Caquinte exhibits a single semantically underspecified locative postposition =ki, and as such applicatives have a high functional load in the introduction of arguments with particular thematic roles.

Verb stems may be nominalized via one of eight nominalizers, three of which differ only in the gender of the noun that they derive, or relativized via the relativizer =ka. Nominalizations permit few verbal categories while all verbal categories are permitted under relativization, and subjects as well as base and applied objects may be relativized. All nominalizers with the exception of -nti derive morphologically inalienable nouns (see below). A rich set of second-position clitics (of which the abovementioned relativizer =ka is one) encode epistemic and deontic modal categories as well as other non-modal, pragmatically distributed categories (e.g., counter-assertive =shine).

Interclausal relations are typically encoded via second-position clitics, e.g., =getti, which expresses temporal point overlap (English when; see Dixon (2009)) and also occurs in the protasis of a conditional. Relations of temporal anteriority are expressed via the combination of =ker-ata=/kerota ‘yet, still’, with =getti; temporal posteriority is expressed with adverbs. Counterfactuality is expressed by =me, which occurs in both the protasis and apodosis. There is no evidence for subordination in complementation: there is no overt complementizer and clausal complements exhibit the full range of verbal categories. The high degree of morphological complexity described so far is illustrated in (1).

(1) ...kameetsanihite irohokahitavakenerigeti kishokiro irishekatakaahiapohenparinihi.

Negation is encoded via two preverbal particles tee and aato: the former negates verbs that denote notionally realis states of affairs and additionally occurs optionally though frequently with the verbal enclitic =hi; the latter negates verbs that denote notionally irrealis states of affairs (e.g., those with future temporal reference). The former results in irrealis marking on the verb, the latter in realis, a sort of canceling out effect that results from the double irreality of the entire proposition (i.e., negation and future temporal reference).

Sentential moods include declarative, interrogative, and imperative ones. Polar questions exhibit no domain-specific marking, while content questions are characterized by the presence of either taa ‘who(m), what’ or ke ‘where, how (many), why, which’, the latter of which inflects for gender. Different interpretations of ke result from complex interrogative constructions involving, among other verbs, the copular verb ko, applicativization, and relativization, which are outside the scope of this description. Positive imperatives are surface-equivalent to their second-person irrealis declarative counterparts; negative imperatives (i.e., prohibitives) are equivalent to their second-person doubly irrealis declarative counterparts (i.e., they are formed on aato).

Caquinte nouns are categorized by their grammatical gender and alienability. The noun phrase exhibits three series of prenominal demonstratives distributed spatially, two prenominal numerals (aparo ‘one’, mavite ‘two’,[7] four plurals (-hia, -vio, -hite, and -pae), and a single underspecified locative postposition =ki. Both =pae and =ki are second-position clitics within the noun phrase,

---

[7] Numerals of higher value are debated, but mavitetapohatsika ‘three’ and gihatapohiroka ‘four’ are attested.
i.e., they attach to a small set of prenominal adjectives, but not to demonstratives or numerals. Adjectives covary with the gender of the noun they modify. Quantifiers appear to be adverbs.

Nominal possession, of the order possessum-possessor, differs based on the alienability of the possessed noun in question. Both sorts of noun are inflected for the person (and in the case of third persons, gender) of their possessors via a prefix. Inalienable nouns combine directly with these prefixes, while alienable nouns additionally combine with the suffix -ne/-te, the relevant allomorph determined by the syllable count of the root. If an inalienable noun is to appear without a possessor, it must take the suffix -tsi/-NTsi, again with the relevant allomorph determined by the syllable count of the root. A large number of weakly referential nouns (see Farmer (2015)) may classify other nouns, enter into compounds with them, and incorporate into both numerals and verbs. Five sets of independent pronouns are distinguished (Table 3), with different information-structural properties (O’Hagan 2015a).

Table 3: Caquinte Independent Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>naatiNpa</th>
<th>naageNti</th>
<th>naro</th>
<th>naroNake</th>
<th>naaketi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>aatiNpa</td>
<td>aageNti</td>
<td>aro</td>
<td>aroNake</td>
<td>aakerti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>avatiNpa</td>
<td>avageNti</td>
<td>aviro</td>
<td>aviroNake</td>
<td>aviketi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>iriatiNpa</td>
<td>iriveNti</td>
<td>irivo</td>
<td>irivoNake</td>
<td>iriketi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>iroatiNpa</td>
<td>iroveNti</td>
<td>iro</td>
<td>iroNake</td>
<td>iroketi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before moving on to the morphosyntactic and semantic description of psych-predicates, it will be helpful to have a more detailed understanding of transitivity in Caquinte. First off, I will refer to verbs as transitive if they may take a nominal complement without requiring additional valence-altering morphology (i.e., an applicative or causative). Caquinte verbs, then, behave differently from one another depending on how their transitivity intersects with reality status class. One sort of verb is a-class as an intransitive, but i-class as a transitive; another is i-class as both an intransitive and transitive; and yet another is a-class as both an intransitive and transitive. No verb is i-class as an intransitive and a-class as a transitive, hence the generalizations regarding active and middle voice above. Many intransitive verbs exhibit no transitive counterpart, in which case it is not possible to place them into one of the three classes summarized in Table 4. In order to reduce potential confusion, I will refer to specific instantiations of a verb as, for example, an ‘a-class intransitive’, or an ‘a-class transitive’.

Table 4: Caquinte Verb Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, some verb roots change reality status class depending on their reality status value. This always involves a change from a-class to i-class in the irrealis, and is a property that must be stated of individual lexical items, as semantically similar a-class verbs may differ in exactly this

---

8These suffixes are argued to be type-shifters in Farmer and O’Hagan (2014).
property, as is shown by contrasting the morphological behavior of sheka ‘eat’, which exhibits no change (2), and mir ‘drink’, which does (3).

(2) a. ...yaavakero ishekatavakaro. REALIS
   i- ag -av -ak -i =ro i- sheka -t -av -ak -a =ro
   ‘...he grabbed it and ate it.’ (pis18)
b. “Noashia noshekatenpari.” IRREALIS
   noashia no- sheka -t -enpa =ri
   INTJ:I’m going 1S- eat -EPC -IRR.A =3M.O
   “‘I’m going to go and eat him.’” (pis68)

(3) a. ...imirahiaka kachohari... REALIS
   i- mir -a -hig -ak -a kachohari
   3M.S- drink -EPCV -PL -TS -REAL.A manioc.beer
   ‘...they drank manioc beer...’ (kis3)
b. “Pimirakite kachohari...” IRREALIS
   pi- mir -aki -t -e kachohari
   2S- drink -AM -EPC -IRR.I manioc.beer
   “‘Drink manioc beer.’” (has71)

Caquinte exhibits one ditransitive verb aman ‘ask for’. Ditransitive verbs in this language can be characterized by the fact that they may license two non-subject arguments without additional valence-altering morphology, and that the enclitic covaries with the gender of the non-theme argument when both non-subject arguments are third person\(^9\). In (4) the non-theme argument is the headless relative ashinkaroka, which covaries with the enclitic =ri.

(4) Arikea tee iramanaherihis ashinkaroka kitsaarentsi.
   ari =kea tee iri- aman -ah -e =ri =hi ashiNT -ak -a =ro
   SS =SC NEG 3M.S.IRR- ask.for -REG -IRR.1 =3M.O =NEG own -TS -REAL.A =3F.O
   =ka kitsaa -re -Ntsi
   =REL dress -NOMZ -ALIEN
   ‘He hadn’t asked the owner of the cushma for it [i.e., the cushma].’ (okp95)

Notably, ohok ‘give’ is not ditransitive given these criteria, but it does exhibit partial ditransitive behavior. It requires the recipient applicative =nV to introduce a non-theme object, but it nevertheless can still not introduce a theme object on its own. To do so, it must be antipassivized via -aNT, a morpheme that reduces the valence of a mono- or ditransitive verb by one. This is identical to the behavior of aman ‘ask for’, as seen by comparing (5) and (6).

(5) “Ohokantahero...”
   a- ohok -aNT -ah -e =ro
   1NCL.S- give -ANTIP -REG -IRR.I =3F.O

\(^9\)When the non-theme argument is a speech act participant and the theme is a third person, both arguments are crossreferenced on the verb and the third-person enclitic covaries with the theme. This is a sort of Person-Case Constraint that also holds for related Matsigenka and is described in [O’Hagan(2014)].
"'We are going to give them [i.e., the women] away...'" (ttk937)

(6) "Yamanantkenpi shetyaonkani."

\[
i\-\text{aman} \-\text{ant} \-\text{ak} \-\text{i} =\text{Npi shetyaoNkani}
\]

3M.S- ask.for -ANTIP -TS -REAL.1 =2O vulture

"'The vulture has asked for you [i.e., your hand in marriage].’" (pam15)

In what follows the foregoing empirical facts will be useful as we review the thematic roles of psych-predicates of differing transitivity, and we turn to that discussion now.

2 Cognition

Caquinte exhibits four verbs that I describe under the notion of cognition. These are \textit{tsa} ‘know’ (§2.1), \textit{hi} ‘believe erroneously’ (§2.2), \textit{kekeh} ‘think’ (§2.3), and \textit{ogimag} ‘dream’ (2.4). The description of the morphosyntax and semantics of these verbs forms the remainder of this section.

2.1 Knowing

Caquintes talk about familiarity with entities and eventualities that are construed as verifiable in the world via the verb \textit{tsa} ‘know’. Morphosyntactically, \textit{tsa} is an \textit{i}-class transitive verb that may take both nominal and clausal complements. Clausal complements may be introduced by the \textit{wh}-word \textit{ke} or directly as a finite verb. A nominal complement is illustrated in (7), which comes from a text in which a woman is surprised to find out that a man believes that she is his wife. Note that \textit{tsa} here may also felicitously be translated as ‘recognize’.

(7) "Imaika, arinpa pitsakena?"

\[
\text{imaika }\text{ari} =\text{Npa }\text{pi-} \text{tsa} \-\text{ak} \-\text{i} =\text{na}
\]

now SS =INCNGR 2S- know -TS -REAL.1 =1O

"'What, do you know me?''' (pam263)

Examples (8) and (9) show that \textit{tsa} may also be translated felicitously as ‘be familiar with’. The former comes from a text in which Caquintes are engaged in periodic skirmishes with neighboring Asháninkas; the latter comes from a text in which a woman suspects her brother to have been lost in the forest. When he unexpectedly returns, he gives her the following explanation.

(8) Okantavaetanake ishikiripite teenika intsaterohi iyapa.

\[
o\-\text{kan}t \-\text{a} \-\text{vae} \-\text{t} \-\text{an} \-\text{ak} \-\text{i} \-\text{i} \-\text{shikiripi} \-\text{te} \text{tee} =\text{nika} \-\text{i-} \\
3F.S- do\-EPV\-DRSTR\-EPC\-ABL\-TS\-REAL.1 3M.P- arrow\-AP \text{NEG} =\text{REAS}\text{:NEG} \text{3M.S-} \\
\text{N-} \text{tsa} \-\text{t} \-\text{e} =\text{ro} =\text{hi} \text{iyapa}
\]

IRR- know\-EPC\-IRR.1 =3F.O \text{NEG} shotgun

‘Their arrows came down like rain because they were not familiar with the shotgun.’ (ttk102)

(9) a. “Arigenti notinpinake.”

\[
\text{ari} =\text{gen}t\text{i no-} \text{tinpina} \-\text{ak} \-\text{i}
\]

SS =RSTR 1S- lose.path\-TS\-REAL.1

‘I only lost the path.’’ (okp112)
b. “Noavaetanake hmm osamani, okitamanpororoipohageti.”
   
   “I went far away, to the top of a mountain.” (okp113)

c. “Tee nontsataherohi kenavokirontsi.”
   
   “I didn’t know the way.” (okp114)

The excerpt in (10) comes from a text in which a young woman who refuses to marry is denied food by her father; she then begins eating manioc secretly at night, the specific situation described below. This example differs from the previous two in that the familiarity ascribed to the entity denoted by the verbal subject (i.e., the father) is not in regards to his daughter specifically, but to the actions that she performs.

(10) a. Otashitakero aintochapaki oshekatapinikaro pitsekariki.

   ‘She toasted the manioc and ate it at night.’ (kam14)

b. Tee intsaterohi oraapanite...

   ‘But her father ... didn’t know about it.’ (kam15)

A similar interpretation is present in (11), which comes from a text in which a kidnapped young woman begins making plans for her escape. Again, familiarity is not in regards to the young woman but to her actions, and as such is translatable via English suspect.

(11) Iroatinpa okenkelamahake kameetsanihite aato itsahitiro.

   ‘She thought hard so that they would not suspect her.’ (ttk1031)

The complement of tsa may be a small clause, as is exemplified via irogeti kepatsipitsa ‘(that) it is clay’ in (12). There is no overt complementizer, and, despite the status of the complement as clausal, the verb is marked with the enclitic =ro, and we will see below that this is part of a broader phenomenon in these constructions by which the subject of the complement verb controls object marking on the matrix verb. As such, instances in which tsa takes a clausal complement may be...
paraphrased as ‘to know of X that Y’, where ‘X’ is the subject of the complement verb and ‘Y’ is the eventuality denoted by that verb.  

(12) “Kero okotakani pitsatantakaroka irogenti kepatsipitsa?”

ke -ro o- ko -t -ak -a =ni pi- tsa -t -aNT -ak -a
WH -F 3F.S- COP -EPV -TS -REAL.A =INTERR 2S- know -EPV -APPL:INSTR -TS -REAL.A
=ro =ka irogentti kepatsi -pitsa =3F.O =REL 3F.PRO dirt -CL:clay-like

“‘How do you know that it’s clay?’” (tsp83)

In example (13) the complement of tsa is the full clause imetohantake. There is no overt complementizer, and, like (12), tsa is marked by the enclitic =ri, which is coreferential with the subject prefix i- of the complement verb metoh ‘kill’. The presence of the enclitic can be seen as a way to disambiguate a construction that involves knowledge of eventualities that do not involve the subject of the matrix verb (cf. know that) from those that do (cf. know how and (16) below).  

(13) Irohokakero imae kameetsanihite intsatantahitakenparika imetohantake.

iri- ohok -ak -e =ro i- mae kameetsanihite i- N- tsa -t
3M.S.IRR- cut(.hair) -TS -IRR.1 =3F.O 3M.P- hair PURP 3M.S- IRR- know -EPV
-aNT -a -hi -t -ak -ENpa =ri =ka i- metoh -aNT -ak -i

‘He cuts his hair [i.e., a warrior] so that people know that he has killed someone.’ (shm130)

When the subject of the complement of tsa is indefinite, tsa itself receives no object marking, as is expected given more general patterns of object marking in this language (see §1.1). This is shown in (14), in which the complement of tsa is the existential verb chooka; the subject of chooka is the headless relative aankeroneka ‘someone who would take her’.  

(14) Otsake chooka aakeroneka koahika mankigamahakenparoneka.

o- tsa -ak -i chooka =Ø ag -ak -e =ro =ne =ka koahika
3F.S- know -TS -REAL.1 EXST =3S take -TS -IRR.1 =3F.O =IRR -REL later
mankiga -maha -t -ak -ENpa =ro =ne =ka
obtain(.spouse) -EXTRM -EPV -TS -IRR.1 =3F.O =IRR =REL

‘She knew that there was someone who would take her and who would later make her their true wife.’ (pam53)

---

10Note that interrogative constructions translatable via English how are formed with the interrogative pronoun ke, inflected for feminine gender, the copular verb ko, also inflected for a feminine subject, and a relativized applicativized stem (see tsa). Note that this construction does not have the same pragmatic force as its English cleft equivalent How is it that you know that it’s clay?!

11Similarly to the interrogative construction described in footnote 10, one sort of purpose clause in Caquinte is formed via the particle kameetsanihite, which precedes the purpose clause, followed by a relativized applicativized stem.

12The subject of chooka is in reality more complex, also consisting of the conjoined constituent koahika mankigamahakenparoneka ‘someone who would later make her their wife’. Although headless relatives of this sort are not obligatorily indefinite in Caquinte, indefinite constructions translatable into English via someone or something are formed, as is the case here, via a headless subject or object relative clause that acts as the pivot of the existential verb (note the paraphrase ‘there exists that which she saw’, i.e., ‘she saw something’).
As mentioned in the introductory remarks, the complement clause of *tsa* may be introduced by the interrogative pronoun *ke*, forming an embedded interrogative construction, as in (15). As above, the matrix verb is marked with an enclitic that is coreferential with the subject of the complement verb. When the verb is not applicativized and relativized, the interpretation of *ke* is ‘where’ (cf. footnote 10).

(15) “...hame amenavakeri kameetsanihite antsakeri kero ikenapohini.”

```
hame a- amen -av -ak -e =ri kameetsanihite a- N- tsa -ak
HORT 1INCL.S- observe -DIR -TS -IRR.I =3M.O PURP 1INCL.S- IRR- know -TS
-e =ri ke -ro i- ken -apoh -i =ni
-IRR.I =3M.O WH -F 3M.S- go.by.route -ALL -REAL.I =INTERR
```

“...let’s go watch them so we know where they’re going.” (shm83)

Clausal complements of *tsa* that are not introduced by *ke* may receive an interpretation that invokes the notion of ability (cf. English *know how*) when the subjects of both the matrix and complement verbs are coreferential, as in (16). In this construction *tsa* exhibits no object marking, and values of sentential polarity and reality status are identical between both verbs.

(16) Irirakea shamaki tee intsatehi inkatsiketehi.

```
iri- ra =kea shamaki tee i- N- tsa -t -e =hi i- N-
3M- DEM:MED =SC Shamaqui NEG 3M.S- IRR- know -EPC -IRR.I =NEG 3M.S- IRR-
katsike -t -e =hi
clear.land -EPC -IRR.I =NEG
```

‘The Shamaqui did not know how to clear land.’ (shm260)

Finally, Caquinte exhibits two stems formed on *tsa* that are worthy of note in the context of this description. One, translatable as ‘teach, instruct’, is derived via the suffixal causative -*akag*; the other, translatable as ‘learn’, is derived via the ablative directional -*an*. Neither the string *tsatakag* nor the string *tsatan* (note *k*-epenthesis) is lexicalized *per se*, since other verbal morphemes may intervene between them, but their collocation may be thought of as lexicalized. Both of these stems are illustrated in (17).

(17) “Hameha antsatakhaiaheni kameetsanihite intsatanahe inkatsiketanahenihi iriatinpa.”

```
hame =ha a- N- tsa -t -akag -a -hig -ah -e =ri kameetsanihite
HORT =XXX 1INCL.S- IRR- know -EPC -CAUS -EPV -PL -REG -IRR.I =3M.O PURP
i- N- tsa -t -an -ah -e i- N- katsike -t -an -ah -e
3M.S- IRR- know -EPC -ABL -REG -IRR.I 3M.S- IRR- clear.land -EPC -ABL -REG -IRR.I
=nihi iriatinpa
=PURP 3M.PRO
```

“Let’s teach them so that they learn how to clear land themselves.” (shm264)

---

13 The Shamaqui are a semi-mythologized ethnomlinguistic group that formerly inhabited the extreme headwaters of modern-day Caquinte territory.
2.2 Belief and Expectation

Caquinte exhibits no verb that may be translated via English believe in a narrow sense. Instead, we will see that the verb hi, an i-class transitive verb, approximates the notion of an erroneous belief, i.e., a belief in P, but in reality not P. It may select for either a nominal or a clausal complement, and clausal complements may be either realis or irrealis. The subject of a realis complements is not coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause; the subject of an irrealis complements is always coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause in the present corpus. Furthermore, the alternation between reality status values is determined by a temporal relation: if the eventuality denoted by the complement temporally precedes the eventuality denoted by hi, then the complement is realis; if it follows it, it is irrealis. Although complements of both reality status values denote eventualities that are never truly realized in the world, irrealis complements also carry an entailment that an attempt at realizing the eventuality was frustrated. That is, some eventuality is believed to be imminent (e.g., desired or attempted), but ultimately it is unrealized. In this way hi interacts with two morphological frustratives in Caquinte, the verbal suffix -ve and the verbal enclitic =me, to be discussed below.

This section first describes constructions involving nominal complements of hi, then clausal complements. Before progressing, however, a word on the morphological analysis of hi itself is in order. Unlike all other verb roots described in this paper, hi appears to be defective in that it is always followed by an invariant set of verbal morphemes, i.e., those that appear to be temporally specific -ak, realis -i, and an as-yet unidentified morpheme =hi, although it is worth noting that the latter is of the same phonological shape as the clitic =hi that associates with realis negation (see §1.1). An alternative morphological segmentation might propose a verb root hikeh – which would be phonotactically well formed in Caquinte – and realis -i. However, this segmentation does not hold up in the face of the position of object enclitics when they are present (see below). Comparative facts in the form of a Matsigenka verb root i, exhibiting a regular loss of Proto-Kampan *h (Michael 2011), also point to a segmentation in which hi is analyzed as the root.

When the complement of hi is nominal – i.e., a noun or pronoun – the verbal word may contain an object enclitic, the distribution of which follows broader properties of differential object marking in the language.

(18) Nohikerihi oevoronti...

no- hi -ak -i =ri =hi oevoroNti
1S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =3M.O =xxx bird.sp.

‘I thought that it was a porotobango...’ (shm243)

(19) ...onposagipoha chorinaki takorororo ihikerohi iro.

o- oNpos -a -ki -apoh -a chorina -ki
**takorororo** i- hi -ak -i =ro =hi iro
IDEO:falling:fruit 3M.S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =3F.O =xxx 3F.PRO

‘...an ungrarahi fruit fell and he thought it was that.’ (ttk868)

14Note an analogy to Klein’s (1994) approach to temporal aspect: here hi establishes a topic time to which its complement, establishing situation time, is relativized.

15This suggests that the distinction between realized and unrealized argued for by Michael (2014) must be calibrated to internal states of belief about the world, and not the world itself.
More frequently, *hi* introduces two elements, the first of which is a pronoun and the second of which is a noun. The two elements form a predicational copular clause (Mikkelsen 2005). In this construction verbal object enclitics are obligatory.

(20) *Ihikeri hi* irio itsino, tee irio...

\[i\_{-} \quad hi \quad -ak\_{-}i \quad =ri_{i} \quad =hi \quad irio_{i} \quad i\_{-} \quad tsino_{i} \quad tee \quad irio \]

3M.S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =3M.O =xxx 3M.PRO 3M.P- body NEG 3M.PRO

‘I thought it was his body, but it wasn’t him...’ (pam349)

(21) *...nohikerohi* irio shekatsimahaka.

\[no\_{-} \quad hi \quad -ak\_{-}i \quad =ro_{i} \quad =hi \quad irio_{i} \quad sheka_{i} \quad -tsi \quad =maha \quad =ka \]

1S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =3F.O =xxx 3F.PRO food -ALIEN =EXTRM =REL

‘...I thought that it was real food.’ (tsp48)

Turning to realis clausal complements, we observe that the ways in which arguments of the clausal complements of *hi* are encoded are various. When *hi* lacks object enclitics, an intransitive subject (S) may be encoded as either a verbal prefix (22) or a verbal enclitic (23), following an aspectual distinction (O’Hagan 2015b), and a transitive object (P) is encoded as an enclitic (24).

(22) *...ihikehi* yoavaetanake osamani...

\[i\_{-} \quad i \quad hi \quad -ak\_{-}i \quad =hi \quad i\_{-}j \quad og \quad -a \quad -vae \quad -t \quad -an \quad -ak\_{-}i \quad osamani \]

3M.S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =xxx 3M.S- go -EPV -DSTR -EPC -ABL -TS -REAL.1 far

‘...he thought that he went far away...’ (kas67)

(23) “*Nohikehi* haai peakenpi.”

\[no\_{-} \quad i \quad hi \quad -ak\_{-}i \quad =hi \quad haai \quad peg \quad -ak\_{-}i \quad =Npi_{j} \]

1S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =xxx brother.FE be.lost -TS-REAL.1 =2S

“...I thought, brother, that you were lost.” (okp107)

(24) “*Nohikehi* pimetohtakenari norihanite.”

\[no\_{-} \quad i \quad hi \quad -ak\_{-}i \quad =hi \quad pi\_{-}j \quad metoh\_{-}it \quad -ak\_{-}i \quad =na \quad =ri \quad no\_{-} \quad irihani \]

1S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =xxx 2S- kill -APPL:MAL -TS-REAL.1 =1O =3M.O 1P son -te -AP

“...I thought that you killed my son...” (ttk45)

When *hi* exhibits an object enclitic, a transitive subject (P) is encoded as a preverbal pronoun and that verb lacks an enclitic (25). Note the parallel with the copular clauses in (20) and (21).

(25) *Ihikerihi* irio imetohake.

\[i\_{-} \quad i \quad hi \quad -ak\_{-}i \quad =ri \quad =hi \quad irio \quad i\_{-}j \quad metoh\_{-}ak\_{-}i \]

3M.S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =3M.O =xxx 3M.PRO 3M.S- kill -TS -REAL.1

‘They thought that they had killed him.’ (ttk932)
Before discussing irreals clausal complements, we first briefly examine the morphological frus-
tratives -ve and =me, and their co-occurrences. The frustrative -ve expresses that the eventuality
denoted by the verb to which it attaches was realized, but with notable consequences of some sort,
often uncharacteristic, unexpected, unusual, etc., as can be seen in (26), in which a certain fish
simply vanishes out of sight. The verb stems in which -ve appears are a-class and realis, i.e., -ve is
a morpheme that conditions a reality status class alternation (see §1.1).

(26) Chapinki namenavekari shavemereto ipeahenkatanakaro.

\[
\text{chapin\kappa no- amen -a -ve -ak -a =ri shavemereto i- peah\kappaka -t}
\]

recently 1S- observe -EPV -FRUST -TS -REAL.A =3M.O fish.sp. 3M.S- vanish -EPC
- an - ak - a =ro
-ABL - TS - REAL.A = EVP[16]

'Yesterday I saw a pac
c but then it vanished.' (imo63)

The frustrative =me expresses that the eventuality denoted by the verb to which it attaches
was nearly realized. Unlike -ve, it attaches to only irrealis verb stems and places no restrictions on
reality status class. Clauses exhibiting =me are often translated as ‘almost X-ed’, ‘wanted to X’,
‘tried to X’, ‘had the intention of X-ing’, etc., where ‘X’ is the relevant eventuality. However, it
need not be translated as such, as can be seen in (27), in which it attaches to the verb of a purpose
clause in order to express that the bathing eventuality was never realized[17]

(27) Arikea oanake kenkevarotanatsika onkahatapanahanem.*

\[
\text{ari =kea o- og - an - ak - i keNkevaro - t - an -atsi =ka o- N-ss =SC 3F.S- go - ABL - TS - REAL.I reach.maturity.FEM - EPC - ABL - SE = REL 3F.S-IRR-kaha - t - apanahaNt - e = me get.in.water - EPC - AM - IRR.I = FRUST}
\]

'Then a young woman went to bathe.' (ttk529)

It occurs optionally but frequently on verbs that follow the adverb pahini/paheni ‘almost’[28],
and it may additionally occur on the adverb itself.

(28) Pahini ometoheme.

\[
\text{pahini o- metoh - e = me}
\]

almost 3F.S- die -IRR.I =FRUST

'She almost died.' (nna51)

It also occurs optionally but frequently on verbs that are complements to the verb iroshi ‘be
nigh’ [29]. The difference between this construction and that involving pahini/paheni is one of
perspective: in the former topic time follows situation time, whereas in the latter it precedes it.

(29) ...iroshipohigeti osotoanaheme iroatinpa...

\[
\text{iroshi - a poh - i = \O - getsi o- sotoq - an - ak - e = me iroatiNpa be.nigh - ALL - REAL.I = 3S - SUB 3F.S- emerge - ABL - REG - IRR.I = FRUST 3F.PRO}
\]

[16] The presence of this evidential indicates that the subject of the verb was expected to be found in a particular
location, in this case the location in which it had been observed moments before.
[17] The enclitic =me also encodes counterfactuality and deontic modality, which are not described here.
‘...when she was about to emerge again [i.e., from her menarche seclusion hut]...’ (sis26)

When =me attaches to the verb of a complement clause, the matrix verb frequently exhibits the suffixal frustrative -ve, as seen for the same verb iroshi ‘be nigh’ in (30). This follows from the observation that the eventuality of the matrix clause (i.e., being nigh) is notionally realized, but with unusual consequences, made explicit here via the non-realization of the eventuality denoted by the complement verb, which is marked with =me.

(30) Irira chonchokoronti iroshivetapohaka irarehetapohenpame imagorehapohi.

When the deer was near to arriving he rested.’ (kis75)

Despite the fact that verbs marked with =me are often translated into Spanish with expressions of desire, intent, or attempt, it is clear in examples such as (28), in which death is to be avoided, that these modal flavors are not inherent to =me. In that vein, we see in (31) that verbs marked with =me may be complements to verbs that explicitly encode desire, such as nInt ‘want’ (see §3.1).

(31) Inintavekakea inkokerome...

With these observations in mind, we return to the irrealis complements of hi, which I argue have a generally frustrated interpretation. Example (32) comes from the abovementioned text involving early humans and the tayra. At this juncture, a young woman is tasting certain delicious foods for the first time.

(32) Ohikehi onteronkerho, tee onteronkerohi.

The excerpt in (33) comes from a humorous text in which a man tries his luck in getting near a woodpecker’s net trap, despite his brother-in-law’s warnings that he should avoid it. The following events then ensue. In (33c) we see that =me attaches to the complement of hi.

(33) a. Ooo chaamantsahaniki, aato agavehana agana.

The example in (33c) comes from a humorous text in which a man tries his luck in getting near a woodpecker’s net trap, despite his brother-in-law’s warnings that he should avoid it. The following events then ensue. In (33c) we see that =me attaches to the complement of hi.
“Ooo, it’s a tiny little trap, it won’t be able to trap me.”” (kon26)

b. Intsiha nosantihero.

\textit{\textit{Intsiha no- san\textsuperscript{ti}h -e =ro}}

\textit{xxx 1S- fart.on -IRR.1 =3F.O}

“I’m going to fart on it.”” (kon27)

c. Ihikehi irisantiherome aitsitari tapik...

\textit{\textit{i- hi -ak -i =hi iri- san\textsuperscript{ti}h -e =ro =me o- ag}}

3M.S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =xxx 3M.S.IRR- fart.on -IRR.1 =3F.O =FRUST 3F.S- grab

-\textit{itsi -t -a =ri tapik}

-\textit{APPL:MAL -EPC -REAL.A =3M.O IDEO:grab.around.body}

‘He was about to fart on it, but right then it grabbed him around his body...’ (kon28)

Later in the same text (34) the man returns to his brother-in-law and explains what has happened to him. In this excerpt we encounter a number of things of interest: in (34a) and (34c) the morphological frustrative -\textit{ve} occurs, presumably because the trapping eventuality denoted by \textit{ag} has had notable consequences, namely that the man trapped has escaped; \textit{hi} occurs in (34b), but, unlike the previous example, =\textit{me} does not attach to its complement, indicating that its appearance is not a grammatical requirement of \textit{hi}.

(34) a. Aavekena imantsatsite kontsenene.

\textit{\textit{o- ag -a -ve -ak -a =na i- man\textsuperscript{tsa} -tsi -te koNtsenene}}


“‘The woodpecker’s net trapped me.’” (kon133)

b. Nohikehi nontsohenkiteri.

\textit{\textit{no- i\textit{hi} -ak -i =hi no\textit{-i} N- tsohe\textit{N}ki -t -e =ri}}

1S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =xxx 1S- IRR- provoke -EPC -IRR.1 =3M.O

“‘I thought I would just provoke him.’” (kon134)

c. Imaikanpani, aato notsohenkitahiri namenakerotari aavekenageti.

\textit{\textit{imaika =\textit{N}pani aato no- tsohe\textit{N}ki -t -ah -i =ri no- amen -ak -i}}

now =\textit{CNTR NEG 1S- provoke -EPC -REG-REAL.1 =3M.O 1S- observe -TS-REAL.1 =ro =tari o- ag -a -ve -ak -a =na =getti}

=3F.O =REAS:POS 3F.S- trap -EPV -FRUST -PERF-REAL.A =1O =SUB

“‘Now I won’t provoke him because I’ve seen how he’s trapped me.’” (kon135)

The example in (35) comes from a text in which a man discovers he is wounded.

(35) Ihikehi intatanake, ichokotivetanaka, osotoahatopohi igamachonkahare okantavaetapohi chochorororo.

\textit{\textit{i- hi -ak -i =hi i-\textit{N- ta -t -an -ak -e i-}}} 3M.S- believe -TS-REAL.1 =xxx 3M.S- IRR- warm.by.fire -EPC -ABL -TS -IRR.1 3M.S- chokoti -\textit{ve -t -an -ak -a o- sotog -a -ha -t -apoh -i}}


3M.P- blood 3F.S- say -EPV -DSTR -EPC -ALL -REAL.1 IDEO:liquid.drip
‘He was going to warm himself by the fire, he sat down, but when he had, much of his blood began to drip out.’ (shm238)

From these examples it is clear that it is insufficient to simply analyze *hi* as the lexical counterpart of *=me*, given that they may both occur in the same sentence (33). I suggest that *=me* and *hi* differ in that the latter requires agency on the part of entity denoted by its subject, whereas the former does not, as evidenced by the fact that the complements of *hi* are attested only with agent subjects, whereas the subjects of verbs to which *=me* attaches are attested with experiencer subjects, e.g., as in the case of *metoh* ‘die’ in (28). The enclitic *=me* is compatible (although, as we have seen, not obligatory) with the complements of *hi* because it simply makes no requirement on agency.

Furthermore, we have seen two distinct patterns regarding clausal complements of *hi*. On the one hand there are realis complements with non-coreferential subjects that denote erroneously held beliefs (nominal complements also fall into this category); on the other hand there are irrealis complements with coreferential subjects that denote frustrated eventualities. What I have described as two distinct interpretations of these complement clauses might arguably be collapsed entirely under the notion of erroneous belief, i.e., the irrealis complements concerning erroneous beliefs about prospective eventualities. Put differently, and with the coreferentiality of subjects in mind, they are erroneous beliefs that concern one’s own actions. Direct elicitation is required to determine whether the apparent coreference restrictions across reality status values is a grammatical restriction or an artefact of my corpus.

2.3 Cogitation

Caquintes talk about cogitation, irrespective of positive or negative affect, via the verb *kenkeh* ‘think (about)’, which, like *ogimag* ‘dream’ (§2.4), co-occurs with a direct speech complement typically introduced by *kan* ‘say’ (36), although it may introduce a direct speech complement itself (37).

\[36\]
a. Oninke oanahe oraanapiteki.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
o-\ n\i n\t\ -a\k\ -i\ \ o-\ o\g\ -a\n\ -a\h\ -e\ \ o\r-\ a\a\p\a\n -t\e\ =k\i \\
3F.S-\ want\ -TS\ -REAL.I\ 3F.S-\ go\ -ABL\ -REG\ -IRR.I\ 3F.P-\ father\ -AP\ =LOC
\end{array}
\]

‘She wanted to go back to her father.’ (ttk1015)

b. Okenkehanake, okanti:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
o-\ k\e n\k\ e h\ -a\k\ -i\ \ o-\ k\a n\t\ -i \\
3F.S-\ think\ -ABL\ -TS\ -REAL.I\ 3F.S-\ say\ -REAL.I
\end{array}
\]

‘She thought and said.’ (ttk1016)

c. “Noshianahe.”

\[
\begin{array}{l}
o-\ s\i h\i g\ -a\n\ -a\h\ -e \\
1S-\ run\ -ABL\ -REG\ -IRR.I
\end{array}
\]

“‘I am going to escape [back there].’” (ttk1017)

(37) a. Ari yaahikena ikatsiketakaahitakena tomirishi.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
 a\r i\ i-\ a g\ -a\ -h i\ -a k\ -i\ -a n a\ i-\ k\a t\i s\i k e\ -t\ -a k a g\ -a\ -h i \\
3M.S-\ grab\ -EPV\ -NREF\ -TS\ -REAL.I\ =1O\ 3M.S-\ clear\ -EPC\ -CAUS\ -EPV\ -NREF
-t\ -a k\ -i\ =n a\ t o m i r i s h i \\
-EPC\ -TS\ -REAL.I\ =1O\ weeds
\end{array}
\]

‘They punished me and made me clear away weeds.’ (tsh91)

b. Irosati nokenkehanahikea:
The eventuality denoted by the verb of the direct speech complement is typically construed as a course of action committed to as a way of resolving some undesirable state of affairs\(^\text{18}\). In (36), a young woman has been kidnapped with her infant child, and, although she purposefully gives off the impression of having become accustomed to her captors’ way of life, she in reality wants to escape. In (37), a young woman is having difficulties getting along with members of the community in which she lives, and commits to going to another Caquinte community to reside. In the former, the narrator is speaking about her grandmother, and reference in the direct speech complement accordingly shifts to the first person; in the latter the narrator is speaking about herself with first person reference, and as such reference in the complement remains constant. In addition, it is important to note that, despite the direct speech complements, the speaker of each is not contextually copresent with any other individuals in the text, and it is not necessary for the speaker to have uttered these words aloud.

This last point is illustrable via texts. In (38) two brothers-in-law are at the river when one guesses (correctly) that all of the fish that he has recently seen disappear before his eyes are in reality the other transformed into those fish for the purpose of freaking him out. The transforming brother-in-law responds.

\[\text{38} \quad \begin{align*}
&\text{a. "Heehe, irotari pamenegeti taaka ipahitapae narotari mana nomintsaroakenpi intati."} \\
&\text{heehe iro } =\text{tari pi- amen } =\text{geti taa } =\text{ka ipahitapae naro} \\
&\text{yes 3f.pro } =\text{CNGR 2s- observe } -\text{IRR.I =SUB what =INDEF miscellany 1.PRO} \\
&\text{=tari mana no- omIN- tsarog } =\text{ak -e } =\text{npI iNTati} \\
&\text{=CNGR RSTR 1s- CAUS- startle } =\text{TS } =\text{IRR.I =2O RSTR} \\
&\text{"'Right, it’s that whenever you see some thing [i.e., an animal], it’s me just wanting to startle you.’” (imo66)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{b. Irira iranianishite ikenkehanake, ikanti:} \\
&\text{iri- ra } =\text{iri- anianishi } =\text{te i- keNkeh } =\text{an -ak -i i-} \\
&3\text{m- DEM:MED 3M.P- brother-in-law.ME } =\text{AP 3M.S- think } =\text{ABL- TS- REAL.I 3M.S-} \\
&\text{kaNT } =\text{i-} \\
&\text{say } =\text{REAL.I} \\
&\text{‘His brother-in-law thought and said:’ (imo67)}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
&\text{c. “Imaikanpani nohokeneri kachohari kameetsanihite namenavakeri inpeanakenpageti.”} \\
&\text{imaika } =\text{Npani no- ohek -e } =\text{nV } =\text{ri kachohari } =\text{kameetsanihite no-} \\
&\text{now } =\text{CNTR 1s- give } =\text{IRR.I =APPL:REC } =\text{3M.O manioc.beer PURP} \\
&\text{1s-amen } =\text{av -ak -e } =\text{ri } =\text{i- N- peg } =\text{an -ak -eXpa } =\text{geti} \\
&\text{observe } =\text{DIR } =\text{TS } =\text{IRR.I } =\text{3M.O 3M.S- IRR- transform } =\text{ABL- TS } =\text{IRR.A =SUB}
\end{align*}\]

\(^{18}\text{In that vein }\text{keNkeh} \text{ is occasionally translated as Spanish }\text{darse cuenta} \text{ ‘realize’, that is, when the thought process that leads to some course of action is perhaps more suddenly stumbled upon than anticipated.}\]
“‘Now I need to give him manioc beer so that I can observe him when he transforms.’”

(imo68)

It is clear that the quotation in (38c) is not directed at the man’s brother-in-law because the objects of the verbs ohok ‘give’ and amen ‘observe’ are third and not second person. Rather, this example appears to closely mirror the lay Western concept of a ‘thought bubble’, something opaque to an interlocutor but recoverable by a third party.

In (36)-(38) kenkeh is intransitive, taking no object enclitic or nominal object. The subject, an experiencer, is the sole argument. The same verb, however, may take an object, in which case that object is interpreted as a theme, the subject matter of cogitation. This can be seen in (39), from a text in which a man is abandoned by his wife, who goes to live incestuously with her brother, a serious taboo. Using kenkeh in this way is a common way of expressing that some entity does not matter (cf. Sp. importar), or is of little significance, i.e., one does not think about it much. There is no other lexical verb in the language to express (in)significance of this sort.

(39) Kenpehi yamenakotahiro irimankigare, iroatinpa tee onkenkehaheri...

ke
npehi
i-
amen
-ako
-t
-ah
-i
=ro
iri-
ma
kigare
iroa
i
pa

near
3M.S.-
observe
-APPL:INDR
-EPC
-REG
-REAL.1=3F.O
3M.P.-
spouse
3F.PRO

tee
o-
N-
kenkeh
-ah
-e
=ri

NEG
3F.S.-
IRR-
think.about
-REG
-IRR.1=3M.O

‘Although near, he watched his wife from afar, but she did not think about him in return...’

(okp6)

Lastly, there appears to be an idiomatic use of kenkeh that has a meaning similar to English ‘joke with’. Morphosyntactically this construction behaves like that in (39), except that the subject is the joker and the object is the one joked with. This is illustrated in (40), from a text in which a young man thought to have been lost returns unexpectedly to his father-in-law and asks him (in the sentence preceding this one) to cut peach palm so that he, the father-in-law, might make good arrows for him.

(40) “Mana pikenkehakena?”

mana
pi-
kenkeh
-ak
-i
=na

RSTR
2S- joke.with
-TS
-REAL.1=1O

“‘Are you just joking with me?’”

(ttk506)

Note that in this example kenkeh lacks a directional, but at present it is unclear whether this contributes a difference in meaning. Further research is needed to better understand the cultural practices of joking (and a number of other very culturally specific references that surround this example) and to see in what sense this meaning can be connected up with cogitation.

19The verb kenkeh need not always co-occur with the ablative -an; it is also attested with the allative -apo and without a directional altogether. In the latter case, however, the extremal -maha is always present, yielding a stem kenkhamaha with a meaning similar to ‘think deeply/intensely’.

20In this way kenkeh differs from many other predicates in Caquinte – e.g., shine ‘be happy’ – which require applicatives to license similar sorts of theme arguments.
2.4 Dreaming

Caquintes talk about dreams via the verb *ogimag* ‘dream’, which also co-occurs with *kant* ‘say’ to introduce a direct speech complement. That is, the content of dreams is relayed via direct quotation of either the dreamer, or of some character in the dream. Quotation of the dreamer is illustrated in (41), in which a spurned Caquinte named Chaanta fears for his life following a dream.

(41) a. Yogimaavaeka, ikantiro imankigare:
   i- *ogimag* -a -vae -ak -a i- *kant* -i =ro i- *mankigare*
3M.S- dream -EPV -DSTR -TS -REAL.A 3M.S- say -REAL.I =3F.O 3M.P- spouse
   ‘He dreamed for a long while, and said to his wife:’ (ttk323)

b. “Imaikatia irimetohahitakahitia.”
   *inaika* =tia *iri*- *metoh* -a -hi -t -ak =ahi =tia
now =Chaanta[21] 3M.S.IRR- kill -EPV -NREF -EPC -TS =1INCL.O =Chaanta
   “Now they’re going to kill us.” (ttk324)

c. “Noanaketatia noshianaketatia.”
   *no-* *og* -an -ak -e =ta =tia *no-* *shig* -an -ak -e =ta
1S- go -ABL -TS -IRR.I =COMMIT =Chaanta 1S- run -ABL -TS -IRR.I =COMMIT
   =tia =Chaanta
   “I am going to flee.”’ (ttk325)

From this excerpt a number of morphosyntactic properties can be described. The dreamer, an experiencer, is encoded as the grammatical subject of *ogimag*. The verb is itself intransitive, the stem being marked with an *a*-class reality status suffix. No *i*-class stems are attested that might take a nominal complement.

At this juncture it is worthy of mention that *ogimag* is diachronically morphologically complex: it consists of the proto-Kampan verb root *mag* ‘sleep’, and the prefixal causative *ogt*. The latter is still productive in Caquinte, but the former has been replaced by the verb *tineoki* ‘sleep’, although it is still productive in related and neighboring languages like Matsigenka. Thus translations of ‘dream’ in diachronic terms can be roughly paraphrased as “make oneself sleep”.

As mentioned above, it is also common to relay in some detail the content of dreams via quotation of other participants, as is evident in the longer excerpt in (42).

(42) a. Opitsekanakegeti yogimaaka, ikantahitiri:
   *o*- *pitsek* -an -ak -i =geti *i- *ogimag* -ak -a *i*- *kant* -a
3F.S- be.night -ABL -TS -REAL.A =SUB 3M.S- dream -TS -REAL.A 3M.S- say -EPV
   -hi -t -i =ri
-NREF -EPC -REAL.I =3M.O
   ‘When night fell, he dreamt, and someone said to him:’ (ttk641)

b. “Piha poanake ontaniki otsenpiki.”
   *piha* *pi- og* -an -ak -e *o- Nta* =niki *o- tseNpi* =ki
go.IMP 2S- go -ABL -TS -IRR.I 3F- DEM:DIST =ADVBLZR 3F- mountain =LOC

[21]Chaanta’s early life is mysterious: he is said to have been found by a Caquinte woman in a pile of rubble following the collapse of a nearby cliff. His nourishment in infancy was tobacco, and he grew to adulthood within a few years. His speech is peppered by occasional lexical items that are unique to him and is marked with the constant use of the enclitic =*tia*, which appears to occur nowhere else in the language.
“'Go there to the mountain.'” (ttk642)

c. “Pamenapohakeri vavaikonta shitaponkatake henoki inchatoki.”

\[
\text{pi- amen -apoh -ak -e =ri vavaiko}^\text{N}\text{ta}^\text{N} \text{shitap}^\text{O} \text{N}\text{ka} \text{t} \text{-ak -e =O}
\]

2s- observe ABL -TS -IRR.1 =3M.O bear build.platform -EPC -TS -IRR.1 =3S

\[
\text{henoki inchato =ki}
\]

high.up tree =LOC

“'You will see a bear building the platform of his house high up in a tree.'” (ttk643)

d. “Pinkahemakokeri, pinkanteri:”

\[
\text{pi- 2s-n irr-kahem shout -ako appl:indr -ak -ts-e irr.i =ri =3m.o pi- 2s-n irr-ka n say -e irr.i =ri =3s}
\]

“'Call out to him, say to him:'” (ttk644)

e. “'Notyaine, taa panti?''

\[
\text{no- 1p-tyai -ne taa pi- aNT -i}
\]

1P- grandfather -AP what 2S- do -REAL.1

“'Grandfather, what are you doing?''” (ttk645)

f. “Iriatinpa iranpatosanakenpa ivakoki taan taan, onposapohenpa sankenakoharivenki.”

\[
\text{iriati}^\text{N}\text{pa}^\text{N} \text{ir-3m.s.irr-n-irr-apatos clap -an abl -ts-e irr.a i-3m.p- vako =ki taan}
\]

3M.PRO 3M.S.IRR-IRR clap -ABL -TS -IRR.A 3M.P- hand =LOC IDEO:slap.surface 

\[
\text{taan o- onpos -apoh -eNpa sankenakoharive}^\text{N}\text{ki}
\]

IDEO:slap.surface 3F.S- fall -ABL -IRR.A sedge

“'He will clap his hands together taan taan and sedge will fall.'” (ttk646)

g. “Arikea paitsitenparo pantsikitsitenparo.”

\[
\text{ari =kea pi- ag -tsi -t -eNpa =ro pi- N- alsik -itsi -t -eNpa =ro}
\]

SS =SC 2S- grab -SEQ -EPC -IRR.A =3F.O 2S- IRR- chew -SEQ -EPC -IRR.A =3F.O

“'Then snatch it up right away and chew it.'” (ttk647)

h. Arikea itinahanaka, ikanti:

\[
\text{ari =kea i- tinah -an -ak -a i- kaNt -i}
\]

SS =SC 3M.S- awaken -ABL -TS -REAL.A 3M.S- say -REAL.1

‘Then he woke up and said:' (ttk648)

i. “Nogimaaka.”

\[
\text{no- ogimag -ak -a}
\]

1S- dream -TS -REAL.A

“'I've dreamt.'” (ttk649)

j. Osavinkagitetanakegeti, yoanake.

\[
\text{o- savinkagite -t -an -ak -i =geti i- og -an -ak -i}
\]

3F.S- rise(.sun) -EPC -ABL -TS -REAL.A =SUB 3M.S- go -ABL -TS -REAL.1

‘And when the sun began to rise, he left [i.e., in search of the bear].’ (ttk650)

Note how the content of the dream is first introduced by the narrator in (42k) via referring to the dreamer and his dreaming eventuality in the third person. Several quotations follow, but the speaker is unidentified, and in (42e) we even see a double embedding of direct speech in which the narrator relays what the unidentified speaker says the dreamer should say. The direct speech is all
a sort of instruction-giving, to be enacted in the real, non-dream world once the dreamer wakes. When he does wake (42), he simply says ‘I’ve dreamt’ (42), without relaying the content of the dream, much like the actual content of the dream in (41) was underspecified.

The prevalence of direct speech in the narration of dreams is quite striking, and can in Caquinte I think be seen as a way to avoid paraphrasing (and in so doing possibly rendering unfaithful the representation of) what are arguably the most internal of internal states of an other. More research is needed on the narration of dreams by dreamers in Caquinte conversation in order to better understand the extent to which the narration of a dream is either simply ellided in these textual examples or is reconstructed by a non-dreamer narrator and cast as direct speech despite that narrator not having had access to the direct speech of the dream.

3 Desire

Caquintes talk about desire via two verbs, niŋt and nehema, which I will gloss as ‘want’ and ‘be desirous of’, respectively; these verbs are the subject of this section. We begin with niŋt ‘want’, since it is the most well attested in the extant corpus, is the most common in discourse, and exhibits the widest range of morphosyntactic properties. Both of the verbs in this section may take nominal complements, but only niŋt may take clausal complements.

3.1 niŋt ‘want’

The verb niŋt ‘want’ is an i-class transitive verb that may take a nominal or clausal complement. The sort of desire denoted by niŋt typically involves an entity or eventuality that is construed as obtainable, as opposed to nehema (see §3.2). A nominal complement of niŋt is illustrated in (43), which comes from a text in which a vulture (transformed into a human) approaches a man and expresses that he would like to marry his daughter.

(43) “Noninkero porihanite.”

no- niŋt -ak -i =ro pi- orihani -te
1S- want -TS -REAL.1 =3F.O 2P- daughter -AP

“I want your daughter.” (pam7)

Complement verbs of niŋt are obligatorily irrealis and exhibit subject prefixes that are either coreferential (44) or non-coreferential (45) with the subject of the matrix verb. It is noteworthy that, as seen throughout this work, verbs with coreferential subjects always exhibit subject prefixes, despite their semantic redundancy.

(44) Oninke age tsipana.

o- niŋt -ak -i o- ag -e tsipana
3F.S- want -TS -REAL.1 3F.S- fetch -IRR.1 palm.sp.

‘She wanted to fetch bijao fronds.’ (kam16)

Unlike some other verbs in Caquinte, however (e.g., tsa ‘know’), niŋt does not exhibit an object enclitic that is coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause when that subject is not coreferential with the subject of the matrix verb (cf. (13)), as in (45).

22 A request of this sort may seem blunt to native speakers of English, but it is the traditional way for a Caquinte man to request a woman’s hand in marriage.
“Noninke pinpochatena.”

\[ \text{no- nïnt -ak -i pi- N- pocha -t -e =na} \]
1S- want -TS -REAL.I 2S- IRR- be.sweet -EPC -IRR.I =I0

“I want you to make me sweet.” (okp136)

Unlike constructions involving tsa ‘know’ in which the subjects of the matrix and complement verbs are coreferential, negation in equivalent constructions involving nïnt ‘want’ does not obligatorily appear on both verbs. Compare (16) with (46) and (47) below. More research is required to tease apart potential interpretational differences between these constructions.

(46) Oroatinpa tee onintehi onchookatehi iginteniki katonkoniri.

\[ \text{oroatinpa tee o- nïnt -e } =\text{hi o- N- chooka -t -e } =\text{hi i-} \]
3F.PRO neg 3F.S- want -IRR.I =NEG 3F.S- IRR- reside -EPC -IRR.I =NEG 3M.P-
\[ \text{gïntenini } =\text{ki katonkoniri} \]
territory =LOC Asháninka

‘She did not want to live in the Asháninkas’ community.’ (ttk1014)

(47) “Imaikanpani tee nonintahehi namenahero...”

\[ \text{imaika =Npani tee no- nïnt -ah -e } =\text{hi no- amen -ah -e } =\text{ro} \]
now =CNTR NEG 1S- want -REG -IRR.I =NEG 1S- observe -REG -IRR.I =3F.O

“Now I don’t want to see her anymore...” (okp145)

Greater degrees of desire are expressed by combining nïnt with the distributive suffix -vae (48).

(48) “Irigenti pinintavaetake kamaarini!”

\[ \text{irigenti pi- nïnt -a -vae -t -ak -i } kamaarini \]
3M.PRO 2S- want -EPV -DSTR -EPC -TS -REAL.I snake

“But you’re only in love with a snake!” (kam86)

3.2 nêhema ‘be desirous of’

The verb nêhema is used to talk about desire that can be conceptualized as distant from some entity, and to a certain degree lustful, avaricious, or covetous. At present nêhema is only attested in reference to particularly tasty foods and women, and it appears to have an implication that the desired object in question is not obtained, or not obtained in full. It is a transitive a-class verb in which the desirer is encoded as the subject, while the theme, the desiree, is encoded as the object.

\[ \text{aato onehemagetahari anenpoantatsika.} \]
\[ \text{aato o- nêhema -ge -t -ah -a } =\text{ri anenpoq -aNT -atsi } =\text{ka} \]
NEG 3F.S- be.desirous.of -DSTR -EPC -REG -REAL.A =3M.O make.big -ANTIP -SE =REL

‘She will not be desirous of that which makes her big [speaking of dietary restrictions].’ (Swift 1988 157)
This is shown in (49), from the narration of a picture book developed by Marine Vuillermet and Antoine Desnoyers in which a man goes hunting, kills capybaras, and then is pursued by vultures. He later guts the capybaras and throws the guts to the vultures to keep them off his trail.

(49) a. Aapoha akaniki inehematsitakari irira shetyaonkani.

b. Inehematsitakari porontonari, irishekatsitakenpari.

‘Some time passes and here the turkey vultures are desirous of them.’ (yac52)

‘They’re desirous of the capybaras, they’re going to eat them.’ (yac53)

It is important to note than the original translation of (49) into Spanish is lo desea comer ronzoco ‘he [read: they] desire to eat [the] capybara’, suggesting that sheka ‘eat’ is a complement of nehema. However, the objects of complement verbs never otherwise intervene between matrix and complement verb in Caquinte, and so I opt to analyze this as two apposed sentences, resulting in a common VO word order.

This verb may historically be morphologically complex, possibly consisting of proto-Kampan *neh ‘see, visit’, and a suffix that in related Matsigenka is -uma or -ima and that expresses that some eventuality obtained to a minor degree, e.g., ‘see slightly, hardly see’ [24]. The cognate Caquinte suffix -ima is not especially productive, and is currently only attested under negation, in which case it exhibits a different interpretation (see footnote [24]).

4 Positive Affect

4.1 shine ‘be happy’

Caquintes talk about positive affective responses to a given state of affairs via the verb shine ‘be happy’, an a-class intransitive verb illustrated in (50).

(50) a. Irira ahitsi ari metohakero ishekatakaro chonchokoronti.

b. Ari shine vaetaka irira ahitsi.

24See the Matsigenka stem neima mentioned throughout [Snell (2011)]. This suffix scopes under negation, yielding interpretations akin to English (not) at all.
‘And thus the jaguar was very happy.’ (caa49)

The reason for a positive affective state, when encoded via a noun, is expressed as an applied object introduced via -vent, as in [51],[25] note that -vent is transparent to reality status class, and the stem remains a-class. This collocation is often translated via Spanish gustar ‘like’.

(51) Iriratika shiishi inehapohakeri iriratika earoto, ishinevenkari.

The verb shine may also express the joy stemming from celebration, as in (52). In this example we see that clausal complements of shine are introduced via the co-occurrence of an object enclitic (itself introduced by -vent) as well as the subordinator =geti on the complement verb.[26]

(52) Arikea itsamarohianake, yamashaihianake, osheki oshineventahiakarogeti aakegeti omankigare.

‘They began to dance and sing as they merrily celebrated her finding her husband.’ (tsp125)

It is common for Caquintes to remark on the positive affective states of themselves and others, especially as concerns the happiness that obtains in children (e.g., a well behaved infant) and that which results from propitious living conditions and from actions undertaken with a high degree of agency (see (50) above).

25The applicative -vent typically introduces an argument that denotes an entity on whose behalf an eventuality is realized, as in [1], from a text in which a warrior tires in a battle in which his daughter has been captured.

26Note that =geti further appears on shine as part of a clause-linking construction.
4.2 Love and Pity

Caquintes talk about familial love via the verb *pi\text{ntsa} ‘love’, which may take nominal complements only. It may refer to the love between spouses \[53\], or that between parents and children \[54\]. It is an *a*-class transitive verb, the subject of which is the one who feels love and the object is the recipient (in a non-technical sense) of that love, i.e., a theme.

\[\text{(53) } \text{“Iinani, osheki nopintsatakenpi.”} \]
\[\text{\textit{iinani osheki no- pi\text{ntsa} -t -ak -a } =\text{Npi}}\]
\[\text{mother much 1S- love -EPC -EPV -REAL.A =2O}\]
\[\text{“Mother, I love you very much.” (okp358)}\]

\[\text{(54) } \text{Iriatinpa orihanite tee irininintehi iriinani, osheki ipintsakaro.} \]
\[\text{\textit{iriatiNpa o- irihani -te tee iri- ni\textit{nt} -e } } =\text{hi iri- ohok -e}\]
\[\text{3M.PRO 3P.S- son -AP NEG 3M.S.IRR- want -IRR.1 =NEG 3M.S.IRR- abandon -IRR.1}\]
\[\text{=ro iri- inani -te osheki i- pi\text{ntsa} -ak -a } =\text{ro}\]
\[\text{=3F.O 3M.P- mother -AP much 3M.S- love -TS -REAL.A =3F.O}\]
\[\text{‘He didn’t want to abandon his mother because he loved her very much.’ (okp336)}\]

Derived stems involving *pi\text{ntsa} suggest, however, that its core meaning may be something slightly different than love in the Western sense. Take the following example, in which a man is speaking to his son-in-law, who is a turkey vulture, explaining why it is that he feels no guilt over having let his daughter run away with an eagle while the vulture was away.

\[\text{(55) } \text{“Mana nohokashikenpiro intati, nopintsatakovekenpi intati.”} \]
\[\text{\textit{mana no- ohok -ashi -ak -i } =\text{Npi } =\text{ro in\textit{tati no- pi\text{ntsa} -t -ako}}}\]
\[\text{RSTR 1S- give -APPL:PURP -TS -REAL.1 =2O } =\text{3F.O RSTR 1S- love -EPC -APPL:INDR}\]
\[\text{-ve -ak -a } =\text{Npi \textit{in\textit{tati}}}\]
\[\text{-FRUST -TS -REAL.A =2O RSTR}\]
\[\text{“I only gave her to you because I took pity on you.”} (pam182)\]

This is a difficult sentence to translate. The Spanish original is *Sólo te entregué, te he hecho favor* ‘I just gave you to her temporarily, I did you a favor’. The appearance of *\textit{in\textit{tati}}* at the end of both clauses indicates that we are clearly dealing with two sentences, and there is no overt marking in the second sentence that construes it as the reason for the first sentence. Nevertheless, conversation with the translator indicated that the meaning of this stem *pi\text{ntsa} * is not as general as English *do a favor*. For example, this expression cannot be used in a context in which one has helped one’s brother-in-law carry a heavy load back to the village. It is also clear that the character in question (the man) never had an especially positive or excited reaction to giving his daughter to the vulture in the first place, which rules out a translation like English *have compassion for*. This leads me to an English translation involving *pity*, namely one in which the man need not have had a particularly positive affective stance toward the vulture at the beginning.\[27\] If that is right, then, we must re-examine the meaning of the root *pi\text{ntsa} * such that its combination with the indirect applicative *-ako* could plausibly yield a meaning like English *have pity on* (assuming, of course, that the stem is not lexicalized). This will be the topic of future research.

\[27\]Note also the presence of the frustrative *-ve*, which expresses that whatever emotion the man felt toward the vulture originally, it has not lasted.
4.3 Custom and Contentment

Caquintes talk about usual states of affairs via the verb *ame* ‘be accustomed to’, an *a*-class verb that may function both transitively and intransitively. Transitive *ame* may take either nominal or clausal complements; the former is illustrated in (56), excerpted from a text in which a fox challenges a tortoise to a fasting competition. The object is encoded as =ro and refers to the proposition in the preceding clause of not eating for three days.

\[(56)\]

\[a. \quad \ldots \text{hameha aato ashekata tres savinkagiteri.} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hame} & \, =h & \text{aato} & \, a- & \text{sheka} & \, -t & \, -a & \text{tres} & \, \text{savinKagiteri} \\
\text{HORT} & \, =\text{XXX} & \text{NEG} & \, 1\text{INCL.S} & -\text{eat} & \, \text{-EPC} & \, \text{-REAL.A} & \text{three day} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“...come on, let’s not eat for three days.” (kis9)

\[b. \quad \text{Naatinpa nametaro...} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{naati} & \, \text{Npa} & \, \text{no-} & \, \text{ame} & \, -t & \, -a & \, =\text{ro} \\
\text{1.PRO} & \, 1\text{S- be.accustomed.to} & \, \text{-EPC} & \, \text{-REAL.A} & =3\text{F.O} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“I am accustomed to it...” (kis10)

This verb is analyzed as expressing an internal state because of uses as in \[(57)\], in which a degree of contentment regarding one’s current situation is expressed. This excerpt comes from the abovementioned text in which a young woman has been captured by enemy Asháninkas; she attempts to convince her captors that she has become accustomed to living among them so that they will not suspect that she is planning her escape. These examples also illustrate the intransitive function of *ame*.

\[(57)\]

\[a. \quad \text{“Aato noshiga, ametanakena.”} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aato} & \, \text{no-} & \, \text{shig} & \, -a & \, \text{ame} & \, -t & \, \text{-an} & \, \text{-ak} & \, -a & \, =\text{na} \\
\text{NEG} & \, 1\text{S- run} & \, \text{-REAL.A be.accustomed.to} & \, \text{-EPC} & \, \text{-ABL} & \, \text{-TS} & \, \text{-REAL.A} & =1\text{S} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“I won’t run away, I’ve become accustomed to things.”’ (ttk1023)

\[b. \quad \text{“Chapinkinpani tee nametenpahi.”} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{chapi} & \, \text{Nki} & \, =\text{NPani tee} & \, \text{no-} & \, \text{ame} & \, -t & \, \text{-eNPa} & \, =\text{hi} \\
\text{recently} & \, =\text{CNTR} & \text{NEG} & \, 1\text{S- be.accustomed.to} & \, \text{-EPC} & \, \text{-IRR.A} & =\text{NEG} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“Not too long ago I wasn’t accustomed to things.”’ (ttk1024)

\[c. \quad \text{“Imaikanpani ametanakena.”} \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{imaika} & \, \text{Npani} & \, \text{ame} & \, -t & \, \text{-an} & \, \text{-ak} & \, -a & \, =\text{na} \\
\text{now} & \, =\text{CNTR} & \text{be.accustomed.to} & \, \text{-EPC} & \, \text{-ABL} & \, \text{-TS} & \, \text{-REAL.A} & =1\text{S} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“But now I am accustomed to things.”’ (ttk1025)

There are two constructions in which clausal complements to *ame* are attested. In one, *ame* is intransitive and its clausal complement is a finite irrealis clause, as in \[(58)\]. Here we also observe that *ame* is employed to describe customs that hold of Caquinte society generally.

\[(58)\] Koramani naatinpa namehiga irohokakeneri noraanapanite.
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{koramani} & \, \text{naatiNpa} & \, \text{no-} & \, \text{ame} & \, -\text{hig} & \, -a & \, \text{iri-} & \, \text{ohok} & \, \text{-ak} & \, -e \\
\text{long.ago} & \, 1\text{PRO} & \, 1\text{S- be.accustomed.to} & \, \text{-PL} & \, \text{-REAL.A} & =3\text{M.S.IRR-} & \text{give} & \, \text{-TS} & \, \text{-IRR.1} \\
\end{align*}
\]

=\text{nV} \quad =\text{ri} \quad \text{nor- aapani} \, -te \\
=\text{APPL:REC} \, =3\text{M.O} \, 1\text{P-} \, \text{father} \, -\text{AP}
'Long ago it was customary that our father give us to them [i.e., male suitors].’ (ttk34)

In another, ame is intransitive but has been causativized by ogi- and its clausal complement is a finite realis clause (59).

(59) “Aatogeti agameta akatsiketi, ankantagetanake sagomare sagomare atantanapakoki.”

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aato} & = \text{geti} \quad \text{ogi- ame} \\
\text{NEG} & = \text{SUB 1INCL.S- CAUS- be.accustomed.to -EPC -REAL.A 1INCL.S- clear.land -EPC} \\
\text{-i} & \quad \text{a- kant} \quad \text{-a -ge -t -an -ak -e sagomare sagomare} \\
\text{-REAL.I 1INCL.S- IRR- do -EPV -DSTR -EPC -ABL -TS -IRR.I IDEO:peel IDEO:peel} \\
\text{a-} & \quad \text{ta} \quad \text{tanapako} = \text{ki} \\
\text{1INCL.P- palm.of.hand =LOC} \\
\end{align*}
\]

“When we are not accustomed to clearing land the palms of our hands peel.” (shm275)

What is notable about these two examples is that ame does not exhibit an object enclitic, nor is the complement verb introduced by the subordinator =geti. Furthermore, the apparent distinction in reality status value between these two constructions appears to be epiphenomenal. That is, customs that hold of Caquinte society as a whole are expressed as irrealis, whereas those that pertain temporarily to smaller groups of individuals are expressed as realis. Targeted elicitation to get at this distinction will be the topic of future research.

5 Negative Affect

5.1 shimanpohanK ‘be sad’

In contrast to shine (§4.1), which expresses positive affective states, Caquintes talk about negative affective states via the verb shimanpohanK ‘be sad’. Like shine, it is an a-class intransitive verb, as illustrated in (60).

(60) Arikea ishimanpohankahiaka shapankari imetohakegeti igoonkinite.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ari} & = \text{kea i-} \quad \text{shimanpohanK} \quad \text{-a -hig -ak -a shapankari i- metoh -ak} \\
\text{SS} & = \text{SC 3MS- be.sad -EPV -PL -TS -REAL.A tayra 3MS- die -TS} \\
\text{-i} & = \text{geti i- koonKini -te} \\
\text{-REAL.I} & = \text{SUB 3MS- father-in-law -AP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Tayra and others were sad when his [i.e., Tayra’s] father-in-law died.’ (tsp204)

The reason for a negative affective state, when it is encoded via a noun, is expressed as an applied object introduced via the applicative -ako (n.b., not -venT, as with shine), as in (61).

(61) Oniinanite osheki oshimanpohankotakararo metohankitsika orihanite.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{on-} \quad \text{tinani -te osheki o-} \quad \text{shimanpohanK -ako} \quad \text{-t -ak -a =to} \\
\text{3F.P- mother -AP much 3F.S- be.sad -APPL:INDR -EPC -TS -REAL.A =3F.O} \\
\text{metoh -aNkitsi =ka o- orihani -te} \\
\text{die -SE =REL 3F.P- daughter -AP} \\
\end{align*}
\]

‘Her mother was incredibly sad over her daughter who had died.’ (sis123)
As with *shine*, it is common for Caquintes to remark on an individual’s negative affective state following some set of events. Furthermore, it is common to follow up a description of one’s internal state (encoded in this instance via *shima*/*pohan*/*k*) with descriptions of physically perceptible correlates of that internal state, e.g., crying and moaning, as in (62). This example comes from a text in which a jaguar asks a deer to bathe his children because he observes that the latter’s are impeccably clean; the deer deceives him, though, and he returns home to find his children covered in scabies, with their fur already peeling off. They subsequently all die.

(62) Ironpa yarehevetapohaha itsovironaki, yameniri ichaahanikirite ishimanpohanakanaka, iraanaka, yasakanaka.

‘Then he arrived back at his house and saw that his children had become sad and begun to cry and moan in pain.’ (caa32)

Sadness is conceptualized as an internal state that coincides with suffering (see §5.2), as made explicit in (63), in which a man has been abandoned by his wife.

(63) Opishonkanaka, atsipetakaakaena, oshimanpohanakaakaena.

‘She abandoned me and went away, she made me suffer, she made me sad.’ (okp144)

5.2 Suffering

Caquintes talk about suffering via the verb *atsipe*\(^{28}\), an *a*-class intransitive verb illustrated in (64). Suffering may be conceptualized as stemming from emotional and explicitly physical hardship. We have seen an example of the former in (63), and we continue by examining the extended text excerpt in (64), an autobiography in which, several decades ago, one Caquinte acquired a dictatorial role in a particular community, with disastrous consequences for its residents\(^{29}\). In (64a), suffering comes from a pattern of tying young girls around by the neck like fish strung on a line; in (64b) it comes from the loneliness resulting from not residing with one’s parents; in (64d) it comes from forced labor and in (64f) from hunger.

(64) a. Naatinpa nochaahanikikegeti osheki natsipevaeka, ipeakaahikena aahanirentsi.

\[^{28}\]The root in some speakers is occasionally realized as *atsiper*\(\text{h}\), but this appears to be an influence from Matsigenka.

\[^{29}\]I have anonymized the name of one character given the sensitivity of this material.
‘When I was little I suffered very much, they treated me like a slave.’ (naa57)

b. Tee nonchookatimoteri itsovironakiteki noraaanite.

tee no- N- chooka -t -imo -t -e =ri i- itsovironaki -te
NEG 1S- IRR- reside -EPC-APPL: PRES -EPC-IRR.1 =3M.O 3M.S- house -AP
=ki nor- aapani -te
=LOC 1.P- father -AP

‘I didn’t live with my father at his house.’ (naa58)

c. Nochookake itsovironakiteki ANON.

no- chooka -ak -i i- itsovironaki -te =ki ANON
1S- reside -TS- REAL.1 3M.S- house -AP =LOC ANON

‘I lived at ANON’s house.’ (naa59)

d. Maasano kenkevarigetankitsika yonperaperahiakari yantahiake pitsekariki aisa savin-kagiteriki.

maasano kekvevari -ge -t -aNkitsi =ka i- onpera -pera -hig -ak
all mature.MALE- DSTR- EPC-SE =REL 3M.S- order -REDUP-PL-TS
-a =ri i- ant -a -hig -ak -i pitsekariki =ki aisa savInkagiteri
-REAL.A =3M.O 3M.S- work-EPV-PL-TS-REAL.1 night =LOC ADD day
=ki
=LOC

‘He ordered all of the young men about and they worked day and night.’ (naa60)

e. Osheki yatsipehiaka chaahanikiripe itase aisa naatinpa natsipetaka notase.

osheki i- atsipe -hig -ak -a chaahanikiri =pae i- tase aisa naatiNpa
much 3M.S- suffer -PL-TS-REAL.A child.MALE =PL 3M.P- hunger ADD 1.PRO
no- atsipe -t -ak -a no- tase
1S- suffer -EPC -TS-REAL.A 1P- hunger

‘The children suffered very much from hunger and I also suffered from hunger.’ (naa61)

Furthermore, we see in (64e) that atsipe may function transitively with no change in reality status class or applicativization; the reason for suffering is expressed as a direct object of the verb (see tase ‘hunger’).

5.3 Socially Dangerous Behavior

This section is devoted to teasing apart the varied interpretations of the verb katsima, an i-class verb that may function both transitively and intransitively without a change in reality status class. Its etymology lies in a combination of what in comparative Arawak studies is referred to as the ‘attributive prefix’ ka-, unproductive in Kampan languages, and the the proto-Kampan word *tsima ‘fire’³⁰

A root †tsima is not attested in Caquinte, it having been replaced by paamari. The Caquinte root katsima expresses a range of internal states that are largely viewed as interpersonally and socially dangerous, such as anger, rebellion, disagreement, hate, etc., that is, those in opposition to the calm that is highly valued among Caquintes and arguably Kampan peoples generally (Johnson

³⁰This is an inalienable root that is defective in all Kampan languages in which it exists. In Matsigenka, for example, its possessed form is tsima (e.g., no-tsima ‘my fire’), while its unpossessed form is tsitsi ‘fire’, which exhibits an irregular deletion of the final syllable of the root before the affixation of the “alienating” suffix -tsi. The prefix ka-, to the extent that it is attested in Kampan languages, combines with inalienable roots, thus its combination with tsima is expected.
It is unlike the internal state expressed by *shima* ‘be sad’ in that no real threat to order is present in the latter. Metaphorically speaking, then, the possession of fire is conceptualized as putting one at risk of behaving in socially proscribed ways. In the following examples I gloss *katsima* differently as is most contextually appropriate.

Perhaps the most frequent use of *katsima* is to express episodes of confrontation between individuals. This can be seen most clearly in contexts of argument or disagreement, as in (65) at which point a character in the text is responding to a question regarding the reason for the apparent thunder rumbling in the sky.

(65) “...arikanpa ikatsimatavakaahiaka irira heokarihite.”

The relevant confrontation can take place between two individuals, as in (66), from a text proffering advice for a good relationship between brothers-in-law, a very important kin relation in Caquinte society.

(66) Aato pikatsimatiri panianishite.

Furthermore, although *katsima* cannot introduce a direct speech complement on its own, it is often followed by *kant* ‘say’, which serves to introduce the content of arguments between individuals.

(67) a. Arikea irira Kamohiri ikatsimakeki ANON ikantiri:

b. “Osheki patsipetakaahiakaena aisa chaahani Kirkpirae.”

That an internal state of anger is occasionally at play is especially evident in instances in which *katsima* functions intransitively and is followed by *kant* ‘say’, introducing a quotation that gives some insight into the details of that internal state.

---

31 Note that the reciprocal suffix -avakag induces a change from i- to a-class.

32 An alternate construction for expressing the anger that might consume an individual is illustrated in (1). In this construction *katsima* is nominalized via the eventuality nominalizer -ka (i.e., ‘anger’) and functions as the subject.
(68) a. Irira kasekari ikatsimatanake ikanti:

```plaintext
iri- ra kasekari i- katsima -t -an -ak -i i- kaNT -i
```

‘The jaguar got angry, saying:’

b. “Namenaherigeti pisonono katsiketi ... noshekakenpari.”

```plaintext
no- amen -ah -e =ri =geti pisonono katsiketi no- sheka -ak -eNpa
1S- observe -REG -IRR.I =3M.O =SUB squirrel.sp. immediately 1S- eat -TS -IRR.A
=ri
=3M.O
```

“If I see that squirrel again I’ll eat him immediately.” (pis45)

A notion similar to that expressed by English _hate_ may also be expressed by _katsima_. In (69), a jaguar has had a variety of tricks played on him by different animals, and he proceeds to go around to several of them asking if they hate him – or perhaps more precisely (and idiomatically) ‘have it out for him’ – and the following is a response by the bear.

(69) “Tee nonkatsimatenpihi.”

```plaintext
tee no- N- katsima -t -e =Npi =hi
NEG 1S- IRR. hate -EPC -IRR.I =2O =NEG
```

“I don’t hate you.” (kas17)

The verb _katsima_ may also describe an internal state that holds when one does not want to obey the expectations or strictures of others. For example, in (70), a young woman does not want to get married despite her parents protestations. Here I gloss _katsima_ as ‘rebel’, in part guided by the use of Spanish _renegar_ by one bilingual speaker of Caquinte in the translation of this token.

(70) ...tee onintehi omankigakenpa, okatsimatake oshekini.

```plaintext
tee o- niNT -e =hi o- mankiga -ak -eNpa o- katsima -t -ak
NEG 3F.S- want -IRR.I =NEG 3F.S- obtain(.spouse) -TS -IRR.A 3F.S- rebel -EPC -TS
-i osheki =ni
-REAL.I much =AUG
```

‘...she didn’t want to get married, she rebelled a lot.’ (kam4)

That the internal state expressed by _katsima_ is proscribed in Caquinte society is made explicit in (71). From the same text about brother-in-law relationships, in this excerpt one man explains why he occasionally laughs (good-naturedly) at the other.

(71) a. “Anianishi, okahenivaeke osheki, irotarite ashinetankenpaka.”

of a transitive verb stem _peakag_, with the experiencer encoded as the object.

(1) Arikea opeakaantakari igatsimaka.

```plaintext
ari =kea o- peg -akag -aNT -ak -a =ri i- katsima -ka
ss =sc 3F.S- transform -CAUS -ANTIP -TS -REAL.A =3M.O 3P- be.angry -NOMZ
```

‘Then his anger transformed him.’ (ttk387)
“Brother-in-law, it’s really funny, that’s why we should be happy.” (mch41)

b. “Aatogeti, aato ashironta, inkantahikahi:”

aato =geti aato a- shiroNt -a i- N- kant -a -hi -ak =ahi
NEG =SUB NEG 1INCL.S- laugh -REAL.A 3M.S- IRR- say -EPV -NREF -TS =1INCL.O

“If not, we won’t laugh and they will say to us:”’ (mch42)

c. “‘Arikanpa ikatsimatake.”’

ari =ka =Npa i- katsima -t -ak -i
SS =CONJ =INCNGR 3M.S- be.angry -EPV -TS -REAL.I

“‘He’s probably angry.’”’ (mch43)

d. “Irotarite noshirontantakaka.”

iro =tari =te no- shiroNt -aNt -ak -a =ka
3F.PRO =REAS:POS =XXX 1S- laugh -APPL:INSTR -TS -REAL.A =REL

“‘That’s why I laugh.’”’ (mch44)

However, it is not always straightforward that the internal state expressed by *katsima* is prescribed in Caquinte society. This root also is also involved in the derivation of ‘warrior’, a highly esteemed role in traditional Caquinte society (72).

(72) Tee irio katsimari irigenti tsaroatsika.

tee i-rio katsima -ri irigenNti tsarog -atsi =ka
NEG 3M.PRO XXX -NOMZ 3M.PRO startle -SE =REL

‘He’s not brave, he’s a coward.’ (ttk20)

I would like to suggest that the qualities that become a warrior (bravery, a fearlessness derived from a certain internal rage, etc.), while valuable in battle and praised in that context, are fraught in more typical Caquinte social settings.

I conclude this section by noting that the object for the internal state expressed by *katsima* (i.e., its theme), when encoded via a noun, is introduced via the applicative -ako, as in (73).

(73) “Ikatsimatakirotsti ashintaroka.”

i- katsima -t -ako -t i -ro =tsi aishiNt -a -ro =ka
3M.S- be.angry -EPV -APPL:INDR -EPV -REAL.I =3F.O =MON own -REAL.A =3F.O =REL

‘Watch out, the owner will get angry over them [i.e., stolen foods].’

5.4 Fear and Fright

Caquinte exhibits two verbs whose semantics involve a “scared” internal state. One, piŋk ‘fear’, denotes a long-term, non-situationally bound fear. It is an *i*-class transitive verb, the subject of which denotes the individual who holds the fear and the object of which denotes the source of the fear. This is illustrated in (74), which comes from a text in which someone is giving advice as to how a woman can best avoid being eaten by a ravenous jaguar.
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(74) “Imaikanpani poashigeteri kiritaki inpinkapoheka aatonihite yatsikinpi.”

imaika =Npani pi- og -ashi -ge -t -e =ri kiri -taki i-
now =CNTR 2S- put -APPL:PURP -DSTR -EPIC -IRRR.1 =3M.O peach.palm -bark 3M.S-
N- pink -apoh -e =ka aato =nihite i- atsik -i =Npi
IRR- fear -ALL -IRR.R.1 =REL NEG =PURP 3M.S- bite -REAL.1 =2O

“‘Now you need to put down peach palm bark, which he will fear, so he doesn’t bite you.’” (okp263)

The other, tsarog ‘startle’, denotes a sudden, situationally bound fright or startle. On the one hand, it may function as an i-class transitive verb, the subject of which denotes the source of the fright and the object of which denotes the individual who is frightened. This is shown in (75), which comes from the same text involving a ravenous jaguar.

(75) “Inani, pantaitanake henoki shitaponkarontsiki aatonihite itsaroapohinpi.”

inani pi- N- atai -t -an -ak -e henoki shitapoNkaro -Ntsi =ki aato
mother 2S- IRR- climb.up -EPC -ABL -TS -IRR.R.1 high.up house.platform -ALIEN =LOC NEG
=nihite i- tsarog -apoh -i =Npi
=PURP 3M.S- frighten -ALL -REAL.1 =2O

“‘Mother, climb high up onto the house platform so that he doesn’t scare you.’” (okp298)

On the other hand, it may also function as an i-class intransitive verb, the subject of which denotes the individual who is frightened (n.b., the reversal of semantic roles). Various degrees of suddenness may be involved in the moment at which fright occurs. In the excerpt in (76), the individual is conceived of as jumping at the moment of fright (i.e., when a tentacle grabs his leg).

(76) a. Ikahavepohaka, ikemaitatigiri tsirek.

i- kaha -ve -apoh -ak -a i- kemaitatig -i =ri
3M.S- get.in.water -FRUST -ALL -TS -REAL.A 3M.S- sense -REAL.1 =3M.O
tsirek
IDEO:tentacle.grab

‘He got in the water and felt something grab around him.’ (kev5)

b. Yohokavaekita komek, itsaroanake, ikanti:

i- ohok -a -vae -aki -t -a komek i- tsarog -an -ak
3M.S- come.close -EPV -DSTR -AM -EPC -REAL.A IIDEO:fright 3M.S- frighten -ABL -TS
-i i- kanT -i
-REAL.1 3M.S- say -REAL.1

‘It came quite close, and he was startled, and said:’ (kev6)

c. “Taashia opahita?”

taa =shia o- pahi -t -a
what =xxx 3P.S- happen -EPC -REAL.1

“‘What’s that?’” (kev7)

In (77), the individual runs away after noticing the distressing presence of sitting mats at her bathing place by the river.
In yet other instances the fright is conceived of as bound by some situation. In (78) that situation holds from the moment at which the woman is told that she is not in danger of being bitten to the moment at which she realizes that she is no longer in danger. In (79) that situation holds from the moment at which the Asháninkas in question see their formidable Caquinte enemy to the moment at which they also realize that they are no longer in danger.

(78) “Pinkantero piinanite aato otsarogi aatotarite natsikiro.”

pi- N- kaNST-e =ro pi- inani-te aato o- tsarog -i aato =tari =te
2s- IRR- say -IRR.1 =3F.O 2P- mother -AP NEG 3F.S- frighten -REAL.1 NEG =CNGR =XXX
no- atsik -i =ro
2s- bite -REAL.1 =3F.O

“‘Tell your mother not to be afraid, I won’t bite her.’” (okp316)

Numerous instances of situationally bound fright, however, may be characteristic of an individual (say, over the course of a lifetime), as is the case of those individuals denoted by the noun derived from tsarog ‘frighten’ via the nominalizer -NTi (80).

(80) Irirakea inpoitankitsika irigenti tsaronti.

iri- ra =kea inpoi -t -ANKITSI =ka irigueNTi tsarog -NTi
3M- DEM:MED =SC be.last -EPC -SE =REL 3M.PRO frighten -NOMZ

‘The one who came last was a coward.’ (shm500)
Finally, the intransitive instantiation of *tsarog* may be causativized with the malefactive causative *omīn*- 81, and that stem takes on the thematic structure of the transitive instantiation of *tsarog* (see above). At present the distinction between this stem and the transitive instantiation of *tsarog* is unclear, although I suspect that the former expresses overt malice on the part of the subject, whereas the former does not.

(81) ...omintsaroakeri oshekini aisa shiishi.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
o- \text{ omīn- tsarog } -ak -i =ri \text{ osheki } =ni \text{ aisa } \text{ shiishi} \\
3F.S- \text{ CAUS- frighten } -TS \text{ -REAL.I } =3M.O \text{ much } =AUG \text{ ADD dog}
\end{array}
\]

‘...it frightened him very much, and the dog as well.’ (tnt55)

5.5 Annoyance

Caquintes talk about bother and annoyance via the verb *asereg*, an *i*-class transitive verb, the subject of which denotes the source of annoyance and the object of which denotes the individual annoyed. A common source of annoyance for Caquintes are inconveniences placed upon others that result from failings of self-sufficiency. This is represented in 82, which comes from a portion of a text disparaging the qualities of vultures in which the narrator moralizes and admonishes Caquinte children not to let those same qualities materialize in themselves.

(82) a. Intineokigiteni, aato yanti, mana irasereantagetake.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
i- \text{ N- tineoki } -gi -t -e =ni \text{ aato } i- \text{ aNT } -i \text{ mana } \text{ iri-} \\
3M.S- \text{ IRR- sleep } -\text{PERM-EPV-IRR.I } =AUG \text{ NEG } 3M.S- \text{ work } \text{-REAL.I } \text{ RSTR } 3M.S.IRR- \\
asereg -aNT -a -ge -t -ak -e \\
annoy \text{-ANTIP } \text{-EPV } \text{-DSTR-EPV } \text{-TS } \text{-IRR.I}
\end{array}
\]

‘He’ll always be sleeping, he won’t work, he’ll just annoy.’ (pam454)

b. Aviatinpa pantake, aato paseregiri pigonoro pamanapinigeki isheka.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{aviatInpa } pi- \text{ aNT } -ak -e \text{ aato } i- \text{ asereg } -i =ri \text{ pi- } \text{ gonoro } \text{ pi- } \text{ aman} \\
2.PRO \text{ 2S- work } \text{-TS } \text{-IRR.I } \text{ NEG } 2S- \text{ annoy } \text{-REAL.I } =3M.O \text{ 2P- fellow } 1S- \text{ ask.for} \\
-apini -ge -ak -e =ri \text{ i- } \text{ sheka} \\
-\text{PLRCT } \text{-DSTR } \text{-TS } \text{-IRR.I } =3M.O \text{ 3P- food}
\end{array}
\]

‘You must work, don’t annoy your fellow Caquintes by always asking each of them for their food.’ (pam455)

5.6 Embarrassment and Shame

Data regarding how Caquintes talk about embarrassment, shame, and like is lacking relative to other psych-predicates that have been discussed in this paper. However, some preliminary observations can be made. This section concerns two verbs *pashive* and *marik*. The former is an *a*-class intransitive verb that appears to denote the internal state that obtains when an eventuality is found to be or may be potentially be construed by others as untrue, inappropriate, inadequate, etc. This can be seen in 83, which comes from the abovementioned text in which a young woman has gone down to the river to bathe, whereupon she finds a number of abandoned palm sitting mats. Frightened, she returns home and reports her findings, but her great-uncle does not believe her.

\[\text{In this way its thematic structure is identical to transitive tsarog (see 5.4). Unlike tsarog, however, it appears to have no intransitive counterpart.}\]
I have translated *pashivent* with the colloquial English expression ‘be all weird’\(^{34}\) in order to capture the fact that no extreme degree of embarrassment or shame appears to be at play here, even given Caquinte social norms. Rather, the young woman appears to want to avoid responding to the challenge of the truth of her previous assertion. That is, this verb appears to denote the internal state in which one wishes to avoid confrontation, censure, embarrassment, and the like. This is in line with the translations given in Snell (2011:363) for related Matsigenka of ‘be embarrassed, be timid’ (translation mine).

The semantics of *marik*, an *i*-class transitive verb, are more difficult to tease apart, but we can get partway by examining the excerpt in (84), which comes from a text in which a ground dove transformed into a woman teaches a man how to better harvest his manioc. They marry, and when her mother-in-law later comes to meet her, she follows her to her swidden to observe the ground dove’s harvesting technique, which involves shaking the manioc tubers off of the stalk. When they return to the house, the following events occur.

\(^{34}\)Thanks go to Kelsey Neely for suggesting this translation.
c. Arikea iroatinpa heento omarikakerokeate.

\[
\text{ari} \ = \text{kea} \ \text{iroatiNpa} \ \text{heento} \ \text{omarikakerokeate}
\]

\[
o- \ \text{marik} \ -ak \ -i \ = \text{ro} \ = \text{kea} \ = \text{te}
\]

SS \ = \text{SC} \ 3F.PRO \ \text{ground.dove.sp.} \ 3F.S- \ \text{call.out} \ -TS \ -\text{REAL.1} \ = \text{SC} \ = \text{xxx}

‘She had called the ground dove out.’ (has88)

d. Omativikanakekea heento...:

\[
o- \ \text{mativik} \ -an \ -ak \ -i \ = \text{kea} \ \text{heento}
\]

3F.S- nod.head.in.silence -ABL -TS -REAL.1 = SC \ \text{ground.dove.sp.}

‘The ground dove nodded her head in silence...’ (has89)

I have opted to translate marik in this context as ‘call out’, in the colloquial English sense that involves revealing an untruth or casting aspersions on courses of action that are socially inappropriate, reprehensible, or insufficient in some way. This verb is translated by those Caquintes who speak Spanish as Spanish asustar ‘frighten’, but it is clear in the above context that fright is not at issue. Relatedly, one might think that a translation like ‘mock’ is more fitting, but that is contradicted by examples such as (85), which comes from a text in which a man warns his brother-in-law not to risk his luck by trying to get too close to a dangerous woodpecker’s net trap.

(85) “Aato pikantiri, pimarikiritsi, pimarikakotirotsi mantsatsi, aatotari aahi aisa.”

\[
aato \ pi- \ \text{kant} \ -i \ = \text{ri} \ \text{pi-} \ \text{marik} \ -i \ = \text{ri} \ = \text{tsi} \ \text{pi-} \ \text{marik} \ -ako
\]

NEG 2S- say -REAL.1 = 3M.O 2S- call.out -REAL.1 = 3M.O = MON 2S- call.out -APPL:INDR

\[
t \ -i \ = \text{ro} \ = \text{tsi} \ \text{maNtsa} \ -tsi \ aato \ = \text{tari} \ o- \ aq \ -ak \ -i \ aisa
\]

-EPC -REAL.1 = 3F.O = MON net -ALIEN NEG = CNGR 3F.S- catch -REG -REAL.1 again

“‘Don’t speak to him, you’ll call him out, you’ll jinx the net and it won’t catch again.’” (kon72)

Note that this sentence contains two instances of marik, a simplex one and one in which it combines with the indirect applicative -ako. In the former the direct object of marik is =ri, which refers to the woodpecker; in the latter the applied object of marik is the net itself, as evidenced by the feminine gender of the enclitic. In this example, unlike (84), ‘call out’ appears to involve the revelation of the woodpecker’s presence. But the composition of this meaning and the indirect applicative -ako is not yet well understood, and is a topic for future research.

6 Direct Quotation

Direct quotation (or reported speech) which can be identified by deictic transposition relative to the matrix verb kant ‘say’ is incredibly frequent in Caquinte. In narrative, narrators quote characters and characters quote other characters. Indirect quotation, which exhibits no such deictic transposition, is also attested, as in (86) and (87).

(86) “Nokantiro oshekatsitakenaro naintochapakite.”

\[
o- \ \text{kant} \ -i \ = \text{ro} \ o- \ \text{sheka} \ -itsi \ -t \ -ak \ -i \ = \text{na} \ = \text{ro} \ no-\text{real.1} \ = 3F.O \ 3F.S- \ \text{eat} \ -APPL:MAL -EPC -TS -REAL.1 = 1O = 3F.O 1P-\text{ntochapaki} \ -te
\]

\[
\text{manioc} \ -\text{AP}
\]

Both direct and indirect quotes are always introduced by kant ‘say’ in Caquinte. The verb occurs 1,107 times in my corpus, more than any other verb.
“I told her that she was eating my manioc.” (has25)

(87) Okantiri iramakenero machaaki...

3f.s. say -REAL.1 =3M.O 3M.S.IRR- bring -TS-I RR.1 =APPL:REC =3F.O lima.bean

‘She told him to bring her lima beans...’ (pam414)

A central question in the study of Caquinte interaction (as well as in the study of psych-predicates) thus becomes: when do speakers employ direct quotation and when do they employ indirect quotation? And when do they not invoke quotation of any sort whatsoever (e.g., ishimanpohankaka ‘he is sad’)? As a foray into answering these questions, we can observe that, crosslinguistically, direct quotation is often understood to be a responsibility-diminishing tool in interaction relative to the content of the quote, whereas indirect quotation is often understood to be responsibility-enhancing. With that in mind, it is useful to reconsider [86], which comes from a text in which a man is relaying his own previous speech that his interlocutor had just overheard as noise but could not understand. The man risks little in this particular interaction in indirectly quoting himself. Similarly, the narrator in [87] risks little in indirectly quoting the relevant character’s command – it simply moves the narrative forward. The resulting expectation, then, is that direct quotation will be employed when the risk associated with responsibility-taking is high.

We have seen that in narrative the attribution of internal states by narrators to characters is fairly common, but we can imagine that the same attribution in interaction may be more perilous. Significantly, it may be more perilous regardless of whether the internal state holds of an other or oneself. Similar claims have been made for many societies (e.g., see Danziger and Rumsey (2013) and contributions therein). As a result, some societies prioritize direct quotation in the communication of internal states (e.g., the personal opinions that one holds), especially when the risk associated with the attribution of those internal states is high. This is the case in Nanti society, members of which speak a language related to Caquinte, as argued in Michael (2001:5, emphasis mine).

The second area of practice involves the use of reported speech to talk about human agency and the evaluative positions that people take. That is, the use of reported speech to talk about how humans effect changes in the world (e.g. by making decisions, giving orders, and making promises), and about the judgements they make as critical beings (e.g. whether something is ‘good’, ‘bad’, ‘acceptable’, etc.). This area of speech reporting practice, I argue, arises because of, and is organized by, a Nanti ideology that takes an individual’s utterance to be the most appropriate means for discussing their agency and evaluative stances.

As a result of the social pay-off of the use of direct quotation, it is unsurprising to find instances in which speakers not only quote others, but also themselves. Furthermore, speakers may occasionally frame as direct quotation a string that was never actually uttered in the world. Michael (2012:322, boldface emphasis mine) describes the latter phenomenon in Nanti.

... one form of quotation is particularly remarkable: the use of quotative constructions to frame as ‘reported speech’ utterances that are being expressed for the first time, rather than drawn from a previous speech event. Of particular interest, Nantis principally employ this practice [sic], which I call concurrent quotative framing (CQF) in taking strong evaluative or epistemic stances in discourse, often in opposition to stances

36Recall that this is what is also at play in constructions involving kenkeh ‘think’ and ogimag ‘dream’.

38
expressed by other participants. As such, the interactional functions of CQF contrast with the distancing and responsibility-diminishing functions often ascribed to reported speech.

The remainder of this section homes in on CQF in Caquinte, as a way of illustrating a particular sort of direct quotation in the language. I suggest that CQF has the opposite pragmatic function relative to Nanti, namely that it serves exactly the ‘responsibility-diminishing functions’ that one expects crosslinguistically, namely to reduce a speaker’s commitment to some stance. This is not always immediately obvious, as we will further see that CQF co-occurs with an explicit marker of commitment =ta. As a result, CQF occurs in instances of commitment, or the taking of ‘strong evaluative or epistemic stances’ (Michael:ibid.). I contend, however, that in Caquinte CQF serves to hedge a commitment that is otherwise expected by an interlocutor. That is, CQF in combination with =ta allows one to commit, but to commit weakly.

To get at this, we examine the excerpt in (88). This text revolves around the mountain cave known as Shitekitsini, the home of a race of demonic semi-humans (kakinteniro) with huge, frizzy hair. The central character is Maremareti, a powerful Caquinte shaman who one day dares to enter the cave. On the relevant day, he announces his intention to enter the cave to his wife and gathers a group of Caquinte men who will accompany him. He takes ayahuasca and begins to hallucinate. Through his trance he enters the cave, grabs one of the kakinteniro, dismembers him, and escapes out the other end of the cave. He returns home to his wife, and some time passes. Later, he returns to the cave to visit the kakinteniro.

(88) a. “Shameti, koraketaikenpi.”

\[
\text{shameti korake}-t \text{-ak}-i =\text{Npi}
\]

co-father come -EPC -TS -REAL.1 =2S

“‘Co-father, you’ve come.’” (shi59)

b. Ikanti:

\[
i- \text{ka}nt -i
\]

3M.S. say -REAL.1

‘He says:’ (shi60)

c. “Hehehe, koraketakena.”

\[
hehehe korake -t \text{-ak}-i =\text{na}
\]

yes come -EPC -TS -REAL.1 =1S

“‘Yes, I’ve come.’” (shi61)

d. “Nokanti namenahaterita shameti.”

\[
no- \text{ka}nt -i \text{no- amen } \text{-aha}-t \text{-e } =\text{ri } =\text{ta} \text{ shameti}
\]

1S- say -REAL.1 1S- observe -AM -EPC -IRR.1 =3M.O =COMMIT co-father

“‘I said, ‘I’m going to visit my co-father.’”’ (shi62)

e. Ari yogichokotitakere, ikantiro irimankigare:

\[
ari \text{i- ogi- chokoti}-t \text{-ak}-i =\text{ri} \text{i-} \text{ka}nt -i =\text{ro} \text{iri-}
\]

SS 3M.S- CAUS- sit -EPC -TS -REAL.1 =3M.O 3M.S- say -REAL.1 =3F.O 3M.P-

mankigare

spouse

‘He sat him down and said to his wife:’ (shi63)

f. “Pintige poniriori ahokavakeneri shameti irishekatapohenpata.”
“Cook sweet potato for us to give to my co-father so he can eat.” (shi64)

g. Arikea aakiti ovoniriorite, otiakero, yameniro Maremaretiini.

h. Teekea iro poniriori ashekataka aatinpa, irogenti ivoniriorite Matsintioni, okehevekaroko poniriori.

i. Ikankiti komek, ikantanake:

j. “Isaashi.”

isaashi

INTJ: ugh

k. Ikantirikea:

l. “Kerokea pihateni, shameti?”

m. Ikanti:
n. “Nokanti nontahenkakiterita shameti osamani.”
no- kaNT -i no- N- taheNkashi -t -aki -t -e =ri =ta
1S- say -REAL.1 1S- IRR- check.on -EPC -AM -EPC -IRR.1 =3M.O =COMMIT
shameti osamani
co-father far
“‘I said, ‘I am going to check up on my co-father.’’’ (shi82)

Following the exchange of a common greeting (88a-c), Maremareti explains the motive for his
presence among the kakinteniro by quoting himself, even though it is not apparent that he has
ever uttered these words before. This string has the temporal deictic properties of direct quotation
(n.b. its irreality), i.e., an utterance Maremareti would have made before arriving among the
kakinteniro. The quote also includes the second-position clitic =ta: this clitic occurs in every
instance of self-quotation in my corpus (as well as in other contexts), and I tentatively analyze it
as a grammaticized marker of a commitment event [Kockelman2004]. Following this, Maremareti
is served an unpalatable sort of sweet potato. His disgust is expressed by the ideophone komek
followed by the interjection isaashi. The ideophone and interjection differ in their utterability: the
former is a description of an eventuality used in narrative that replaces more contentful words like
fully formed verbs; the latter is actually uttered out loud by Maremareti. Both are introduced by
kaNT, but crucially the stems differ: ideophones are typically introduced by a form of ‘say’ marked
with the associated motion suffix -aki; interjections are introduced by a form of ‘say’ that may also
be used to introduce the longer quotations that we have seen elsewhere.

After this, the kakinteniro again speaks to Maremareti, and the form of his question in (88l) is
noteworthy in that it, like Maremareti’s utterance in (88d), exhibits the temporal deictic properties
of an utterance that precedes Maremareti’s actual arrival to Shitekitsini, i.e., the verb is irrealis
and as such can only have a future temporal interpretation. This question (‘Where are you going
to go?’) is answered in (88n) and is another instance of CQF. The cumulative effect, then, is to
locate the portions of the interaction between Maremareti and the kakinteniro beyond their greeting
((88a)-(88c)) at a time that wholly precedes their actual interaction.

With these facts in mind, then, we can ask the following question: why do Maremareti and his
interlocutor discuss Maremareti’s course of action (i.e., visiting) as if it has not yet been realized,
when in fact it is currently underway? To begin to formulate an answer to this question, let us first
observe that three different aspects of the grammar are at play here: 1) irreality; 2) the enclitic =ta;
and 3) the embedding of a proposition that contains these first two bits within a self-quotation.
Furthermore, these three aspects are not independent. All instances of =ta in the present corpus
(n=95) co-occur with irrealis inflection, and all instances of CQF in the present corpus exhibit =ta.
It thus becomes useful to compare instances of =ta outside of CQF.

A salient and frequent use of =ta occurs in the announcement of an individual’s planned activities
for the day, an exchange that often takes place between spouses in the morning, as in (89).

(89) a. Osavinkagitetanakegeti, ikantiro imankigare:
o- savinkagite -t -an -ak -i =geti i- kaNT -i =ro i-
3F.S- rise.sun -EPC -ABL -TS -REAL.1 =SUB 3M.S- say -REAL.1 =3F.O 3M.P-
maNkigare
spouse
‘When the sun had risen, he said to his wife:’ (kon138)
b. “Nonkatsiketeta.”
no- N- katsike -t -e =ta
1S- IRR- clear.land -EPC -IRR.1 =COMMIT

“I’m going to clear land.” (kon138)

Exchanges between spouses of this sort – frequent in narrative – never involve CQF. I interpret this as indicating that there is little social damage that would accrue to the speaker should he not in fact clear land, or should he do so improperly or unsuccessfully, etc., and as such that committing to this stance involves little risk. Thus the speaker commits to the stance in full.

Coming back to the previous text (88), it is possible to describe the characters’ interaction in a similar fashion. Maremareti’s arrival at Shitekitsini is perilous both for him as well as for the kakinteniro, whose existence risks being found out by others in the human world. Put differently, the consequences of a commitment to a stance are potentially quite serious. As a result, the need to mitigate social risk is high, but this is in tension with one additional facet of the situation, namely that Maremareti must indicate some purpose for his unexpected re-arrival. This, in a less risky context, might take the form of a simple commitment with =ta (see (89)). The grammar of Caquinte, however, provides another option besides choosing between full commitment – i.e., a declarative irrealis sentence with =ta – and no commitment. That dichotomy is avoided entirely by employing CQF (88d). That is, it allows an interactant to frame a commitment as quoted (or reported), and thus indexically signal that it is a lesser commitment than it otherwise would be, in turn mitigating social damage should a course of action not go according to plan (e.g., Maremareti and the kaki's interaction, or Maremareti’s visit more generally). CQF is, then, I argue, a hedge, or a form of weak commitment, which can subsequently be picked up by an interlocutor.

This pick-up takes the shape of an arguably distinct phenomenon, namely the formulation of questions in the irrealis (i.e., with future temporal reference (88)) in a context in which what is really being asked about is realis (i.e., has already come to pass). Thus the kakinteniro asks ‘Where will you go?’ and not ‘Why have you come?’ Similarly, I argue that this is a risk mitigation strategy in that the kakinteniro signals to Maremareti that he (Maremareti) is not at present responsible for the commitment that the kakinteniro is soliciting, since it is framed as temporally posterior to the moment of utterance. It also reduces the degree to which the kakinteniro is seen as asking a face-threatening question.

I conclude this section by reviewing what can be said regarding the interaction between direct quotation and psych-predicates, and the implications that has for the depiction of internal states. As we have seen, only two psych-predicates – kenkeh ‘think’ and ogimag ‘dream’ – occur with direct quotations. In contrast, it is common in narrative for the internal states denoted by all other psych-predicates to be directly asserted of some other. That is not to say, however, that Caquintes will readily or flippantly make reference to those states in interaction. There is a substantial difference between asserting an internal state of a(n often fictional or mythologized) character in narrative and doing the same with regard to real interactants, fellow Caquintes, etc., and the ways in which this difference might manifest is a fruitful area for future research. Nevertheless, it is clear that whatever those ways of speaking are, it is not codified in the grammar for all internal state predicates.

7 Summary and Conclusion

The descriptive generalizations that can be stated with regard to Caquinte psych-predicates are summarized in Table 5. This table is organized along the X-axis by the following properties as distributed across transitivity: reality status class, the thematic roles of arguments, the type of clausal complement, and the reality status value of that clausal complement. ‘Derived’ verbs are
morphologically complex, e.g., derived with the causative. Gray cells in the Derived column indicate that the relevant forms have simply not been described, not that they are unattested.\textsuperscript{37} Along the Y-axis is a list of the seventeen verbs described in this paper. Black cells indicate that the verb in question does not have the relevant function (e.g., does not have an intransitive instantiation).

A number of observations can be made. First, intransitive, transitive, and derived verbs may all be either i- or a-class. The S argument of intransitive verbs all exhibit the thematic role of experiencer, which is in line with the fact that the eventualities that they denote are all internal states. The arguments of transitive verbs, however, show more variation in thematic role assignment. Most transitive verbs exhibit experiencer subjects and theme objects, e.g., in the case of \textit{ame}, a subject who is the one accustomed to something denoted by the object, the theme. One verb, \textit{katsima}, exhibits an experiencer subject and a recipient object. And three exhibit causer subjects and experiencer objects. In this vein, note that \textit{caus-exp} is not simply the inverse of \textit{exp-thm}. For example, themes of verbs like \textit{ame} 'be accustomed to' are not necessarily the cause of being accustomed, but rather what one is accustomed to. The cause of \textit{tsarog} ‘frighten’, however, is also what one is frightened by. These thematic roles may be further manipulated by derivational suffixes such as causative -\textit{akag} or various applicatives. Importantly, there is a difference between verbs that have simplex intransitive and simplex transitive counterparts (e.g., \textit{tsarog} ‘frighten’), and those that have only simplex intransitive instantiations, their transitive counterparts being derived via valence-altering morphology (e.g., \textit{atsipe} ‘suffer’). Furthermore, there are verbs with no simplex intransitive instantiations (e.g., \textit{asereg} ‘bother’). That is, there is no syntactically parallel way in Caquinte to express English constructions such as \textit{I am bothered}.\textsuperscript{38}

Speaking of clausal complements, it becomes evident that only four psych-predicates take embedded clausal complements. Two others co-occur with \textit{kant} ‘say’ to introduce a direct speech quotation, and although such complements are not complements of the psych-predicate \textit{per se}, I list them here with ‘ds’ (‘direct speech’) in parentheses. Of the three verbs that take embedded clausal complements, two allow their complements to exhibit either of the two notionally possible reality status values. The third, \textit{nint} ‘want’, requires an irrealis clausal complement.

The goal of this paper has been to present a morphosyntactic and semantic description of psych-predicates in Caquinte, as a way of establishing a foundation on which to base future investigation of the study of other sorts of internal states in the language expressed by other morphosyntactic means. However, the course of this research is not unidirectional, and much regarding the use of psych-predicates in interaction remains to be learned. As a consequence, the description of the lexical semantic content of the psych-predicates described here is liable to change over time. In terms of morphosyntax, we have reviewed a number of properties of constructions that include psych-predicates that will be of further interest to the more narrowly syntactic study of Caquinte, including, among other topics, the assignment of thematic roles, the status of clausal complements, restrictions on and differences in interpretation between different coreference patterns across clauses, the expression of negation across clauses, and the distribution of the reality status classes and requirements for certain reality status values in these constructions. In this way I hope to have opened up many possible avenues for a variety of analytical interests, both my own and those of other scholars.

\textsuperscript{37}The description of the interpretation of all valence-altering morphemes is outside the scope of this work.

\textsuperscript{38}However, these transitive verbs can be made intransitive via the antipassive -\textit{ant}, but this does not alter the thematic role of the subject as in the case of English \textit{I am bothered}. 
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Table 5: Summary of Morphosyntactic and Semantic Properties of Caquinte Psych-predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>INTRANSITIVE</th>
<th>TRANSITIVE</th>
<th>DERIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RS S-θ</td>
<td>RS A-θ</td>
<td>Comp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsa</td>
<td>'know'</td>
<td>i EXP</td>
<td>i EXP THM</td>
<td>emb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi</td>
<td>'believe ...'</td>
<td>i EXP</td>
<td>i EXP THM</td>
<td>(ds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kenkeh</td>
<td>'think'</td>
<td>i EXP</td>
<td>i EXP THM</td>
<td>emb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ogimag</td>
<td>'dream'</td>
<td>a EXP</td>
<td>i EXP THM</td>
<td>(ds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nǐnt</td>
<td>'want'</td>
<td>i EXP</td>
<td>i EXP THM</td>
<td>emb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nehema</td>
<td>'be desirous of'</td>
<td>i EXP</td>
<td>i EXP THM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shine</td>
<td>'be happy'</td>
<td>a EXP</td>
<td>a EXP THM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pintsa</td>
<td>'love'</td>
<td>a EXP</td>
<td>a EXP THM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ame</td>
<td>'be accustomed to'</td>
<td>a EXP</td>
<td>a EXP THM</td>
<td>emb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shimasphønk</td>
<td>'be sad'</td>
<td>a EXP</td>
<td>a EXP THM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atsipe</td>
<td>'suffer'</td>
<td>a EXP</td>
<td>a EXP THM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>katsima</td>
<td>'be angry'</td>
<td>i EXP</td>
<td>i EXP REC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pinski</td>
<td>'fear'</td>
<td>i EXP</td>
<td>i EXP THM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tsarog</td>
<td>'frighten'</td>
<td>i EXP</td>
<td>i CAUS EXP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asereg</td>
<td>'bother'</td>
<td>i EXP</td>
<td>i CAUS EXP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pashivent</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>a EXP</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marik</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>i EXP</td>
<td>i CAUS EXP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>